

"The History of Eastern Iran," by A.D.H. Bivar,
Chapter 5 from *Cambridge History of Iran* (London,
1983), Volume 3(1), pp. 181-231.

This material is presented solely for non-commercial
educational/research purposes.

CHAPTER 5

THE HISTORY OF EASTERN IRAN

Even during the heyday of the Achaemenian empire an active part was played in its history by the peoples of eastern Iranian stock and language. As early as the battle of Marathon (490 B.C.) the Sakas – Iranian nomads of Central Asia – had fought side by side with the élite troops of the Persian centre. On board the Persian fleet at Salamis in 480 B.C. the marines, a corps no doubt specially selected for their reliability, included Sakas as well as Medes and Persians. In addition the land army which Xerxes led to Greece in the same year contained many eastern Iranian contingents. The “Amyrgian” Sakas of Herodotus (who are called the Saka Haumavarga in the Old Persian inscriptions, and who, in the hieroglyphic inscriptions of Darius I from the Suez Canal are defined as the “Sakas of the plains”, as opposed to the “Sakas of the marshes”)¹ were then brigaded with the Bactrians under the command of Hystaspes, a son of Darius. Also present were the people of Aria (Herāt), led by Sisamnes; Parthians and Chorasmians led by Artabazus; Sogdians under Azanes, and Sarangians (Drangians), from the country of the lower Helmand, under Pherendates. The Chorasmian, Dargman b. Harshin, named in an Aramaic papyrus of 464 B.C. from Elephantine in Egypt, and engaged in litigation over land with one of the Jewish inhabitants,² could thus have been a pensioned survivor from Xerxes’ Grand Army. In this way, the principal eastern Iranian nations, both nomadic and sedentary, make their first appearance in the pages of history. At this early date they were naturally somewhat overshadowed by their rulers, the Medes and Persians, whose closer acquaintance with the ancient civilizations of Mesopotamia had given them a lead in the techniques of centralized government, and so enabled them to dominate their eastern neighbours. Ultimately, however, the sedentary eastern Iranians, such as the Chorasmians and Sogdians, were able to achieve virtual or complete independence. The nomadic Sakas in their turn were even able to set up an extensive empire, including a large part of northern India, during the 1st century B.C.

¹ G. Posener, *La Première Domination perse en Égypte* (Cairo, 1936), p. 185.

² A. E. Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.* (Oxford, 1923), p. 15.

It was during the campaigns of Alexander the Great, after the Macedonians had overrun the western provinces of the Persian empire, that the eastern Iranian element became especially prominent in the Persian camp. For the Persians at the battle of Gaugamela (331 B.C.) an important part was played by the Bactrian and Saka cavalry, whilst contingents from Parthia, Sogdia and Arachosia are also mentioned. The leader of the Sakas at this battle bore the name of Mauakes, which in its later form Maues was to become famous once again in the history of the Indo-Scythian empire (see below, p. 194). The majority of these eastern Iranian troops had been mustered by Bessus, who after the Persian defeat quickly emerged as the most powerful of the Persian leaders under Darius III. Thus after the assassination of the king, it was Bessus who assumed the royal prerogatives, and retired to his satrapy of Bactria to carry on the struggle against Alexander in eastern Iran.

Alexander's pursuit of Bessus thus brought about a Macedonian invasion of the eastern provinces, where a Macedonian influence was established more lasting than that which had been introduced into western Iran. From Artacoana, probably at the site of the modern city of Herāt, a wide southward sweep led the conqueror across Drangiana and Arachosia to the valley of the Kabul river, and the foot of the Hindu Kush. To secure his communications in these provinces, many fortified cities were founded by Alexander; Artacoana was replaced by Alexandria-amongst-the-Arians; in Drangiana, Alexandria-Prophthasia provided a garrison centre; Alexandria-amongst-the-Arachosians was sited, as the recently discovered inscriptions of Aśoka seem to imply, at the Old City of Qandahār; and Alexandria-of-the-Caucasus stood probably on the Salang river at Jabal Suraj, not far from Charikar. It was from this last foundation that Alexander led his army northwards across the range, the speed of his movements baffling all attempts at resistance. The unhappy Bessus retreated to the north bank of the Oxus, but when Alexander threw his troops across the broad river on improvised rafts of hide, the satrap's followers turned against their leader, placing him under arrest, and handing him over to Alexander for execution.

After the capture of Bessus, Alexander advanced to Maracanda (Samarkand), and thence to the river Jaxartes (Syr Daryā). Yet local resistance was by no means at an end. The immediate occasion of the rising which followed was Alexander's order to the local chiefs to

assemble for a conference at Bactra, an instruction which was thought to mask some sinister purpose. The communities along the Jaxartes rose and put to death their Macedonian garrisons. Altogether seven walled towns shut their gates on Alexander. These were rapidly reduced by his energetic siege operations, the most considerable of the cities being Cyropolis, a settlement of which the name survives in the present-day Kurkath. The Macedonians in revenge put to death all the male inhabitants of these towns, and enslaved the women and children.

Meanwhile Alexander's forces were being threatened on two other fronts. On the north bank of the Jaxartes a force of Saka horsemen had assembled, and were preparing to attack the Macedonians. At the same time news was received that the garrison which had been left behind at Maracanda was being besieged by the local chief Spitamenes. With covering fire from his siege-catapults, Alexander was able to send his forces across the Jaxartes and disperse the Sakas. But reinforcements sent to relieve the garrison at Maracanda were caught at a disadvantage during an incautious pursuit of the enemy, and were defeated with heavy losses. It was only when Alexander brought up his main army by forced marches from the Jaxartes that the situation was restored.

Soon afterwards, Alexander went into winter quarters at Bactra. But towards mid-winter he moved out with five columns and crossed the Oxus to suppress unrest in Sogdiana. Spitamenes consequently transferred his activities to the south bank of the river, and even attempted a raid against Bactra itself. However, he was ultimately defeated in a number of engagements with detachments of the Macedonian cavalry, and eventually returned to Sogdiana. There his Saka auxiliaries turned against him, cutting off his head and sending it to Alexander. Or, if the version of Quintus Curtius (VIII. iii. 13) can be believed, the murder of Spitamenes was the act of his estranged wife.

The turning point in Macedonian relations with the people of Sogdiana was Alexander's marriage to the Iranian heiress Roxana, daughter of the influential chief Oxyartes, a prominent leader of the local resistance to the conqueror. When a mountain stronghold of Oxyartes was captured by the Macedonians, Roxana fell into Alexander's hands. Subsequently he was able to win over Oxyartes, who in turn effected Alexander's reconciliation with Chorienes, another chief who was still resisting. Thus the bitter hostility which the people of Bactria and Sogdiana had initially displayed towards the Macedonians



Map 4. Historical map of Central Asia.

was replaced by a mutual understanding, and Alexander was able to enlist the Sogdian, Bactrian and Saka cavalry who served him well in India at the battle of the Hydaspes.

There is also evidence that Alexander settled in the garrison cities of eastern Iran large numbers of homeless Greek mercenary soldiers. Some of these were no doubt Greek mercenaries who had been in the service of Darius III, though the majority were detachments from Alexander's own forces. The settlements provided the nucleus for the substantial Greek colonization of Bactria and Sogdiana which was to become an important factor in the history of the 3rd and 2nd centuries B.C. Yet these involuntary settlers did not always perform with docility the role for which they had been chosen. In 326 B.C. when Alexander was recovering from wounds sustained during fighting against the Malli in India, a rumour of his death reached the settlers in Bactria and Sogdiana. Weary of their long exile in a distant land, about three thousand men banded themselves together to march back to Greece, but the sources are in conflict as to their fate. Diodorus (xvii. 99. 5) reports that they were massacred by Macedonian troops, but according to Quintus Curtius (ix. 7) they reached their homes. A more serious mutiny of the settlers took place after Alexander's death at Babylon in 323 B.C. According to Diodorus (xviii. 7. 2) no less than twenty-three thousand men mutinied and set out on their homeward march. They were intercepted and massacred by Macedonian forces sent out from Babylon by Perdiccas under the command of Pithon. Tarn, however, believed that this figure for the number of mutineers was greatly exaggerated.¹

After Alexander's death the satrapies of his empire were divided between his officers. Sibyrtius received Arachosia, and Oxyartes, the father of Roxana, was confirmed as satrap of the Paropamisadae along the Kabul river. To Stasanor was allotted Aria and Drangiana, whilst Philip retained the satrapy of Bactria and Sogdiana. During the War of the Successors all these governors supported Eumenes against Antigonus; but after his final victory near Iṣfahān Antigonus returned to the west, leaving them undisturbed in possession of their satrapies.

In 312 B.C. Seleucus returned to Babylon and founded the Seleucid empire. He at once embarked on the reconquest of the eastern provinces from their independent satraps. However, he was less successful when he attempted to invade the Maurya empire of India under its new

¹ Tarn, *The Greeks in Bactria and India*, p. 72.

ruler Chandragupta. Ultimately Seleucus was obliged to cede to the Mauryas his easternmost provinces, that is to say at least the Paropamisadae and Arachosia. Though Tarn argued to the contrary,¹ the recent discovery of inscriptions has made it clear that Maurya control of these two provinces was effective. In addition to the fragmentary Aramaic inscription of Aśoka from Laghmān now in the Kabul Museum,² recent years have brought to light two inscriptions of Aśoka in the Old City of Qandahār. One of these is a bilingual in Greek and Aramaic describing the benefits conferred on his subjects by Aśoka's conversion to Buddhism; the second, in Greek only, contains a portion of Aśoka's thirteenth pillar edict, and calls for harmony between the Buddhist sects. A third inscription in Aramaic, later reported from Qandahār, contains fragmentary Buddhist texts.³ The presence of these inscriptions confirms that in the time of Aśoka (the grandson of Chandragupta) the Mauryas had effective control of the Paropamisadae and Arachosia. However, confirmation is lacking for Strabo's inherently less probable statement that a large part of Aria was also ceded by Seleucus to Chandragupta.⁴

Though obliged to cede his most easterly provinces to the Maurya, Seleucus none the less consolidated his grip on Bactria, Margiana and Sogdiana. An invasion of Saka nomads from the north was eventually beaten off, though it appears that they first succeeded in destroying the city of Marv. In 293 B.C. the king's son Antiochus, whose mother, Apame, was the daughter of the Bactrian Spitamenes, and who was thus himself half-Iranian, was posted to Bactra as joint king to direct the defence of the eastern frontier. In honour of the young prince Marv was refounded under the name of Antiochia-in-Margiana, whilst the Seleucid mint of Bactra issued coins with the joint names of Seleucus and Antiochus. However, when Antiochus succeeded to the sole rule in 280 B.C., his attention was diverted to the problems of Asia Minor, and the Seleucid hold on eastern Iran began to weaken.

It was before the death of Antiochus I in 261 B.C., as a newly discovered inscription of Gurgāan now shows,⁵ that a certain Andragoras was appointed as Seleucid satrap of Parthia and Hyrcania. During the succeeding reign, that of Antiochus II (261–246 B.C.), Andragoras

¹ *Ibid.* p. 100.

² W. B. Henning, "The Aramaic inscription of Asoka found in Lampāka", *BSOAS* XIII (1949), pp. 80–88. A second Aramaic inscription of Aśoka from Laghmān was published by A. Dupont-Sommer, "Une nouvelle inscription araméenne d'Asoka trouvé dans la vallée de Laghman (Afghanistan)", *CRAI* 1970, pp. 158–73. ³ *JA* 1966, 437–70.

⁴ Strabo xv. 724.

⁵ Robert, "Inscription hellénistique d'Iran".

began to assert a claim to autonomy by the issue of coins in gold and silver. These were, however, inscribed only with the satrap's personal name, and without the royal title. However, within a few years Andragoras had been crushed by a new power, that of Arsaces, founder of the Parthian empire, who overran the province at the head of his nomadic followers, the Parni. Though Wolski has advocated a lower chronology, it seems best to regard the starting point of the Arsacid era in 247 B.C. as marking the overthrow of Andragoras, and the moment of Arsaces' succession as ruler of Parthia.

At about the same date, and further to the east in Bactria, another Seleucid satrap was working his way to independent sovereignty. This was the celebrated Diodotus, the founder of the Bactrian kingdom. His rise is marked by the appearance, on coins still carrying the name of Antiochus II, of a new portrait. It is accompanied by the new ruler's punning device, the figure of Zeus hurling the thunderbolt. On later issues the name of Diodotus appears with the royal title. According to a statement of Justin (xli. 4. 9) Diodotus (whom he calls Theodotus) was succeeded by a son of the same name. However, numismatic authorities disagree as to whether the portraits of two Diodoti can reliably be distinguished on the coins.

The defection from the Seleucid empire of the satrapies of Bactria and Parthia must have become permanent as a result of difficulties from which the empire suffered after the death of Antiochus II in 246 B.C. According to the remarkable inscription seen at Adulis on the Red Sea by the Christian monk Cosmas Indicopleustes¹ in the 5th century A.D., the king of Egypt, Ptolemy III Euergetes, invaded Seleucid territory, crossed the river Euphrates and subjected to himself Mesopotamia, Babylonia, Susiana, Persis, Media and the rest of the empire, as far as the borders of Bactriana. Thus Parthia and Bactria were for a time left in isolation, and their links with the Seleucid government were never re-established.

It was not until the reign of Antiochus III the Great in 208 B.C. that an attempt was made to reconquer Parthia and Bactria for the Seleucid empire. Antiochus marched eastwards from Ecbatana, and invaded the province of Hyrcania, which was then part of the Parthian empire. There he captured a palace at Tambrax and stormed the entrenched city of Syrinx, before passing eastwards to cross the river Arius (Harī Rūd) and to invade Bactria. The Bactrians were at this time under the rule of Euthydemus, a Greek of Magnesia, who directed a stout

¹ *The Christian Topography*, ed. E. O. Winstedt (Cambridge, 1909), pp. 73-4; also cf. Justin xxvii. i. 9.

resistance. After the Bactrian cavalry had failed to defend the crossing of the Arius, Euthydemus retreated to stand a siege at his capital of Bactra, where he was protected by high mud-brick ramparts and extensive marshes. Antiochus besieged the city for two years, but in vain. Then, intimidated by his opponent's threat to admit the dangerous Saka nomads of the northern steppe, Antiochus granted terms. Euthydemus – who claimed he was no rebel, but the slayer of the children of rebels (i.e. of Diodotus) – was allowed to retain his kingdom. However, he surrendered his elephants to Antiochus, and concluded a treaty of alliance with him. At the same time the kingly bearing of Euthydemus' son Demetrius so impressed the Seleucid that he offered the young prince a daughter in marriage – a contract that seems not to have been fulfilled. Antiochus then marched on to the district of the Paropamisadae, in the upper valley of the Kabul river. There he made terms with the Indian prince Sophagasenus, and returned at last to his capital by the long road through Carmania and Persis. Meanwhile Euthydemus was left alone at Bactra as the ruler of the Greeks of eastern Iran.

Only scattered fragments survive of the works of the ancient historians who told the story of the Bactrian kingdom – in particular Apollodorus of Artemita, and Trogus. These have been pieced together with the evidence of the varied and beautiful coinage rediscovered over the last hundred and fifty years, with the progress of archaeological exploration in the Punjab and in Afghanistan. The famous work of Tarn, *The Greeks in Bactria and India*, provides a stimulating reconstruction of the history of the Bactrian Greeks. Yet sceptical readers have been inclined to suspect an element of exaggeration in the ancient sources, when they speak, for example (Strabo xv. 686), of the “thousand cities” of Bactria,¹ or the Indian conquests of Demetrius, Apollodotus and Menander. Apart from their coins archaeological reconnaissance in northern Afghanistan had until recent years revealed so little trace of the Bactrian Greek settlements that Foucher wrote with some justification of “le mirage bactrien”.² It was only in 1964 that the site of a great fortified city was discovered by the Délégation Archéologique Française en Afghanistan in Badakhshān, at the junction of the rivers Kokcha and Oxus.³ The modern name of the site is Ai Khānum, and

¹ Cf. pp. 9, 243–4.

² A. Foucher, *La Vieille Route de l'Inde de Bactres à Taxila* 1 (Paris, 1942), 73.

³ Schlumberger and Bernard, “Ai Khanoum”. For the very extensive subsequent results of excavations, see now Bernard, *Fouilles*.

the peninsula between the two rivers is cut off to the south-east by a system of powerful ramparts. Two citadels were discovered, with an upper and lower city, and in the latter pottery of the Hellenistic period was found lying on the surface. This pottery included stamped amphora handles bearing the Greek inscription of an *agoranomos*. Thus no doubt remains that for the first time a definite settlement of the Bactrian Greeks has been located. It may indeed be true that the principal cities of the Bactrian kingdom were situated along the banks of the Oxus river. It supports this view that the famous treasure of Graeco-Bactrian coins at the Kabul Museum, known as the Qunduz Hoard, was found at the mound of Khisht Tepe, situated on the banks of the Oxus to the north-west of Qunduz.¹

After the death of the emperor Aśoka towards 236 B.C. the Maurya empire in India began to disintegrate; we have seen that during the campaign of Antiochus III its northernmost provinces were under the rule of Sophagasen. The latter also soon disappeared, and in about 190 B.C. the power vacuum in northern India invited an invasion on the part of the Bactrian Greeks. The evidence of their coins suggests that of the Indo-Greek kings descended from Euthydemus, Demetrius I, Apollodotus I and Antimachus I Theus were all prominent in these expeditions, though their relative chronology has not been finally established. It is clear that the Greeks quickly crossed to the south of the Hindu Kush range, and established themselves at Kapisa in the upper Kabul valley, the modern Begram; at Pushkalāvati (Charsada) near Peshawar; at Gardīz; and at Taxila in the Punjab. However, a new danger was soon to threaten these Euthydemid princes from the rear. For the formidable Eucratides, perhaps, as Tarn suggested, an emissary of the Seleucid Antiochus IV Epiphanes sent to effect the reconquest of Bactria, had risen against Demetrius I north of the Hindu Kush. When the latter returned from India to oppose him, it was only to meet defeat and death.

The subsequent kings who attempted to uphold the Euthydemid cause in Bactria, Euthydemus II, Agathocles and Pantaleon, were evidently short lived. Soon the house of Eucratides, which besides its founder included Eucratides II Soter, Plato and Heliocles, had established undisputed control of this territory. Their success was, however, less overwhelming when they advanced to conquer the Indian territories of the Euthydemids, for there it seems that a new personality,

¹ Curiel and Fussman, *Le Trésor monétaire de Qunduz*, pp. 9, 83-7.

the celebrated Menander, had arisen to oppose them. It is not easy to define the connection of Menander with the house of Euthydemus. Tarn suggested that he might have been a general of Demetrius I who married a sister of Agathocles, but the evidence is tenuous. Yet whatever his origins Menander established himself firmly at Pushkalāvati, perhaps after a brief incursion there by Eucratides, and soon established a powerful kingdom. Since the coins of Menander are by far the commonest of all the Indo-Greek issues coming to light at Charsada, his reign must have been long. Moreover, his fame amongst the Buddhists of India was so great that he was made the interlocutor in the Buddhist text *Milindapañha* ("The Questions of Menander"), a religio-philosophical dialogue in almost the Platonic manner.¹

Almost the only evidence for the later history of the Indo-Bactrian kings is the arrangement of their coins, a task with which the evolution of the coin legends and the sequence of the monograms afford some help. None the less, substantial uncertainties remain, and though the list of rulers and their approximate sequence can be determined, the evidence is hardly sufficient to provide the basis for a continuous narrative.

There are grounds for the belief that the Indian era of c. 155 B.C. (found, for example, in the Taxila copper-plate of Patika,² and called by Tarn the "Old Saka" era) was in fact an Indo-Bactrian era established by Menander, and commencing from the year of his accession. If this deduction is correct, the date provides a fixed point in the history of the later Indo-Bactrian rulers. To the following decade, that running from 145 to 135 B.C., must be attributed the career of Antialcidas, the Indo-Bactrian king who is mentioned in the Brahmi inscription of the Besnagar pillar (cf. Narain, *The Indo-Greeks*, pl. VI). Though the inscription connects the king's ambassador with the city of Taxila, the monograms of the coins of Antialcidas suggests that he was also in control of Gardiz and Pushkalāvati. His authority may in fact have extended over all the principal Indo-Bactrian centres.

In the last generation of Indo-Bactrian rulers, c. 135–125 B.C., the dominant figure is that of Strato I. His reign appears to have commenced at Pushkalāvati, but to have been interrupted by the incursions

¹ *Milindapañha*, tr. I. B. Horner, London, 1963; *The Questions of King Milinda*, tr. T. W. Rhys Davids, Oxford, 1890 (Sacred Books of the East, xxv). On the coins of Menander, see now Bivar, "The sequence of Menander's drachmae", *JRAS* 1970, p. 131, where his reign is estimated on numismatic evidence at nearly 10 years.

² See below, Appendix IV, no. 3.

THE NOMAD INVASIONS

of several rivals, in particular by that of Heliocles. It could be presumed that the Heliocles known from the Indo-Bactrian coin series is the same personage as figures in the list of the kings of Bactria, though Whitehead believed that the Indo-Bactrian portrait was of a second ruler of the same name.¹ In any event Strato I later reappears in the coin series of Pushkalāvati, and to this second phase of his coinage belong the unusual issues which show the young king's bust jugate with that of a queen who is named as Agathocleia. She was believed by Rapson² and Tarn to be the mother of Strato, though it is hard to be sure that she may not actually have been his wife. This issue is immediately followed by another with jugate portraits, that in the joint names of Hermaios and Calliope. Subsequently, however, there are further issues of Strato from the same mint; but the fourth phase of his coinage, that bearing the titles ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΣΩΤΗΡΟΣ ΕΠΙΦΑΝΟΥΣ ΣΤΡΑΤΩΝΟΣ, is found only in the series attributable to Taxila and Gardiz.³ It therefore appears that Strato transferred his centre of operations to these places from Pushkalāvati. At the two former mints, Taxila and Gardiz, the successor of Strato was evidently Archebios; and it was long ago suggested by Tarn, with much plausibility, that Archebios was in this area the immediate predecessor of the first Indo-Scythian ruler, Maues. The table given as Appendix 1 thus shows the probable succession of Indo-Greek and Indo-Scythian rulers in the Indo-Iranian area from the second century B.C.

THE NOMAD INVASIONS

The complex and disturbed succession of the later Indo-Bactrian rulers was to a large extent the consequence of a far-reaching event which took place in approximately 130 B.C. This was the nomad invasion of the Bactrian kingdom. The movement of peoples which swept away the Greek rulers on the Bactrian plain had its origins in disturbances far away on the Central Asian frontiers of China. The story has often been told of how the Hsiung-nu⁴ (a tribe from which subsequently originated the Huns of European history) rose to become a great

¹ R. B. Whitehead, "Notes on the Indo-Greeks, Part III", *NC* 1950, p. 211.

² J. Rapson, "Coins of the Graeco-Indian Sovereigns Agathocleia, Strato I Soter, and Strato II Philipator", *Corolla Numismatica: Numismatic Essays in Honour of Barclay V. Head* (Oxford, 1906), p. 245.

³ Bivar, "Indo-Bactrian Problems", p. 107.

⁴ W. M. McGovern, *The Early Empires of Central Asia*, pp. 117, 126ff; R. Grousset, *L'Empire des steppes*, Paris, 1939; E. Chavannes, "Les Pays d'Occident d'après le Heou Han Chou", *T'oung Pao* VIII (1907), 149. [On this section cf. pp. 539ff.]

power and a threat to the rulers of north China. Their kingdom reached its zenith under the great Maotun (c. 209–174 B.C.) who defeated the neighbouring tribes and established himself as the overlord of the steppes. To the south-west of the Hsiung-nu in Kansu province, there pastured another tribal confederacy of rather mixed composition known as the Yüeh-chih. These too were defeated by Maotun, whilst further to the north he impinged upon their neighbours the Wu-sun, and drove them also towards the west. After the death of Maotun his son, Giyu, also known as Lao-shang, again attacked the Yüeh-chih, routing them, and killing their king in battle. The survivors of the Yüeh-chih, being pastoral nomads like the Hsiung-nu, were finally driven to trek away towards the west, passing, it seems, down the valley of the Ili river and along the southern shore of Lake Issyk Kul. From this region they expelled a group of Saka tribes, designated in the Chinese chronicle (the *Ch'ien Han Shu*)¹ by the term Sai-wang (meaning "Saka king"), and drove them away to the south-westwards. On their march, however, the Yüeh-chih had collided with the Wu-sun, who now returned to attack them in the rear, and drive them headlong into Farghāna on the heels of the Sakas. Thus soon after 160 B.C. two powerful hordes, the Sakas and the Yüeh-chih, were poised on the Graeco-Bactrian frontier of the river Jaxartes.

At this point western sources take up the story of the nomad conquest of Bactria. Scholars generally agree that the Yüeh-chih of the Chinese sources are in fact identical with the tribe named as the Tochari in the western texts. Subsequent happenings are described in a well-known passage of the *Geography* of Strabo (XI. 511): "The nomads who became the most famous were those who took away Bactriana from the Greeks – the Asii or Asiani, the Tochari, and the Sacaraucae, who set out from the far bank of the Jaxartes adjoining the Sacae and Sogdiani, which the Sacae had occupied."

The doings of the Asiani are also mentioned in two of the *Prologues* of Pompeius Trogus. Prologue xli contains the statement "The Scythian tribes of the Saraucae [*read*: Sacaraucae] and the Asiani seized Bactra and Sogdiana." This passage corresponds closely with the account given by Strabo, whilst Prologue xlii, referring to later events, includes the sentence "The Asiani became kings of the Tochari, and

¹ Cf. A. Wylie, "Notes on the Western Regions", *Journal of the Anthropological Institute* xi (1882), 84; K. Jettmar, *Die frühen steppen Völker*, Baden-Baden, 1964. "Saka" represents the Iranian and Greek forms of the name, written in Latin as "Saca", and in strict transliteration of the Indian sources as "Śaka".

the Saraucæ [*read*: Sacaraucae] were destroyed.” It will be seen that although the names may not be etymologically identical, the historical rôle played by the Asiani is precisely that of the people who later came to be known as the Kushāns, founders of the Kushān empire. It is, moreover, evident that these displaced nomad groups quickly overran the Graeco-Bactrian kingdom lying to the north of the Hindu Kush range. Tarn’s deduction seems to be correct that the invasion took place at a date between 141 B.C. and 129 B.C., when a wave of nomad invaders is reported by Justin (XLII, 1–2) to have burst into Parthia.

Direct evidence is lacking for the subsequent movements of the nomad tribes. It is likely, however, that the Sakas travelled to the south by way of Herāt, passing through Drangiana and the region of the Helmand bend, which subsequently became known as Sakastān, from which derives the region’s modern name of Sīstān. Later, following in the tracks of Alexander, they would have passed north-eastwards through Arachosia, before turning east towards the Indian plain through the various passes in the Sulaimān range and the North-west Frontier. Meanwhile the Tochari bequeathed their name to Tukhāristān, the region of Qunduz and Baghlān in modern Afghanistan, which commands the northern approaches to the passes of the Hindu Kush. They too will ultimately have made their way to Gandhara by the more direct, but arduous, route of the mountain passes. However, the march of the Tochari lasted nearly a hundred years longer than that of the Sacaraucae, who were thus left in almost undisputed control of the Punjab throughout the 1st century B.C.

The theory that the Sacaraucae turned westward after their sack of Bactra is confirmed by the sensational finds of gold treasure excavated in the summer of 1979 by the Soviet archaeologist V. I. Sarianidi at Tilla Tepe, near Shibarghan in Afghanistan. These rich burials around the remains of a prehistoric temple were shown by numismatic and other evidence to be much later, 1st century B.C. to 1st century A.D., and were characterized by their massive offerings of gold. The brief reports so far available¹ suggest that the objects belonged to two distinct styles. The first, represented by at least one golden libation-bowl (*phiale*) of strictly Classical form, is presumably to be interpreted as a relic of the Hellenistic civilization of Bactria. Yet the bulk of the finds reflect a specific “Animal style”, already known from a bracelet of the Oxus Treasure,² and a pair of gold armlets in Peshawar and at Cologne.³

¹ *Time Magazine*, 2 July 1979; Sarianidi, *Archaeology* xxxiii. 3 (1980), 31–41.

² Dalton, p. 39, nos. 144–5.

³ Jettmar, p. 178.

These southerly finds are manifestly related to the goldwork of the Siberian collection of Peter the Great, now at Leningrad. Yet similar contorted forms, and polychrome inlays in turquoise and garnet, are typical of the gold pieces from Shibarghan. There, however, one remarkable piece, a gold clasp based on a rendering of the Greek god Dionysus in his leopard-chariot, though similarly decorated, was obviously inspired by a Hellenistic prototype. In all probability the Shibarghan burials reflect a westward movement of the Sacaraucae from the pillage of Bactra, loaded not only with any surviving Hellenistic treasure, but also with surplus gold that had been melted down, and reworked according to their taste. Evidence not only for the route of the Sacaraucae, and for the fantastic opulence of the spoils of Bactra, the excavations also cast light on the origins and inspiration of the various schools of Scythian art. A sensitive analysis is likely to show that just as many objects from Siberia illustrate Achaemenian themes remodelled to the taste of the tribal craftsman, so the finds of Shibarghan illustrate a comparable metamorphosis of Hellenistic subjects. For the immediate narrative, however, the impression which results from these new finds is of the astonishing affluence of the Saka chiefs, who, after the capture of Bactra, led their peoples to the conquest of Southern Asia.

Yet if the Sakas travelled, as seems most likely, by the Arachosian route, it is surprising that the first Saka ruler to issue coins was Maues in the heart of the Indo-Bactrian kingdom at Taxila. This circumstance led Narain¹ to resort to a theory that Maues and his Sakas had reached Taxila by travelling southwards from Kāshghar over the "Hanging Pass" into Indus Kōhistān. It is indeed scarcely credible that a cavalry force should have travelled by such precipitous routes; but the problem remains, and its solution could well be that Maues was a commander of Saka mercenaries in the service of the Greek kings, who gained control of the kingdom from within at a moment when an external Saka onslaught was pending. It is notable that according to Jenkins' analysis² the subsequent Saka rulers, such as Vonones, Spalirises and Azes I, issued coins first in Arachosia, as might have been expected in the case of invaders coming from the west. Yet an even more important point which emerges from Jenkins' study is that the immediate successors of Maues at Taxila were not Sakas but Greeks. It was only after the intervening reigns of Apollodotus II and Hippostratus that Saka rule was once more restored by Azes I.

¹ *The Indo-Greeks*, pp. 135ff.

² Jenkins, "Indo-Scythic Mints", p. 2.

The earliest date for Maues, if the reading can be trusted, is provided by the Maira well inscription of 98 B.C., the latest by the copper-plate of Patika from Taxila, which is dated to 78 B.C. It appears that Maues died far to the south-east of his capital, at Mathurā. For the Lion Capital from that site seems to have been his monument, with its long inscription containing the names of many Saka chiefs, and referring to “solemnities over the illustrious king Muki and his horse” (*Muki-[śrī]raya saśpa [a]bhusavit[a]*). It is said to have been erected “in honour of the whole of Sakastan” (*sarvasa Sak(r)astanasa puyae*). A. H. Dani has indeed recently shown that the writing of certain portions of the inscription displays the letter forms characteristic of the Kushān period, and nearly two centuries later than the date of the personages who are named.¹ Yet this circumstance need not cause us to doubt the authenticity of their information. It is likely enough that the Buddhist monks whose establishment was founded to keep alive the memory of the king possessed a copy of their foundation deed on perishable material. When it began to show signs of wear, they would naturally have transcribed it upon the monument itself. The reference to the role of the horse in connection with the Saka funeral rites is a vivid and appropriate detail. Comparison may be sought with the numerous cases of horse-sacrifice in Scythian burials in south Russia; or again, with the funeral of Rustam in the *Shāh-nāma*.²

It may be surmised that the last expedition of Maues to Mathurā, and the concentration there of the principal Saka chiefs (whose names are listed in the inscription) took place during a campaign to reduce the last Indo-Greek garrisons in the area. Rajula, who is prominently mentioned, subsequently became satrap of Mathurā, and issued coins which form the direct sequel to issues of the Greek kings Strato II and Apollophanes in that area. Meanwhile the death of Maues seems to have robbed the Sakas of a unified leadership. The prince (*yuvaraja*) Kharahostes was supposed by Konow to have been the heir to the imperial title.³ If he is rightly identified with the personage of the same name who issued coins, he was not, indeed, the son of Maues but of a certain Arta, otherwise unknown, whom Konow conjectures to have been the brother of the Saka emperor. Since the coins, in bronze only, carry the title merely of “Satrap”, it seems that Kharahostes never

¹ A. H. Dani, “The Mathura Lion Capital Inscription (A Palaeographical Study)”, *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Pakistan* v (1960), pp. 128–47.

² Firdausī, *Shāh-nāma* vi (Beroukhim edition, Tehrān, 1935), p. 1743, l. 4334.

³ CII II, Part I, *Kharoshthī Inscriptions*, p. 36.

effectively succeeded to the empire. The type of his coins is "*king mounted with lance*", which suggests that he later held office as a contemporary, no doubt a subordinate, of Azes I.

A notable coin discovery now shows that the immediate successor of Maues at Taxila was a woman, perhaps his queen, whose name appears in Greek as ΒΑΣΙΛΙΣΣΗΣ ΘΕΟΤΡΟΠΟΥ ΜΑΧΗΝΗΣ, a spelling which may represent the Iranian name Māhīn.¹ A new name has thus been added to the list of queens who played a part in history. Naturally the lack of a male heir at this critical time will have placed the Saka confederation in jeopardy. This was the moment when, as the coin analysis shows, the Indo-Greek king Apollodotus II regained control of Taxila, and presumably expelled the Sakas from the city. Apollodotus II was followed in turn by another Greek king, Hippostratus, the volume of whose coins suggests a reign of some duration. It was at this point that Azes I, ruler, as we have seen, in Arachosia, appears on the Punjab scene as champion of the Saka cause. There followed a ding-dong struggle between the Greeks and Sakas for control of Taxila. Azes I was once more expelled by Hippostratus, but finally reasserted himself to establish the definitive supremacy of the Sakas.

A fixed date is provided for the final restoration of Azes I in the Punjab by the fact that he was apparently responsible for the inauguration of the so-called Vikrama era, which commenced in 57 B.C., and which is still in use in India today. In two early inscriptions, the Kalawan copper-plate of the year 134, and the Taxila silver scroll of the year 136,² datings in the Vikrama era are designated by the term *ajasa* (or *ayasa*), which is best interpreted "of Azes". It may be assumed that the era commenced with the date of Azes' accession, and that it more probably relates to his restoration than to his earlier, interrupted, reign. There is consequently justification for reckoning Azes' restoration as having occurred in 57 B.C. This hypothesis, that the Indian Vikrama era of 57 B.C. originates with the accession to the paramount power of Azes I, is now explicitly confirmed by a newly-discovered Kharoṣṭhī inscription.³

The successors of Azes I were Azilises and Azes II. There are no

¹ G. Le Rider, "Monnaies de Taxila et d'Arachosie: une nouvelle Reine de Taxila", *Revue des Etudes Grecques* LXXX (Paris, 1967), p. 341.

² See Appendix IV, nos. 14 and 15.

³ H. W. Bailey, "Two Kharoṣṭhī casket inscriptions from Avaca", *JRAS* 1978, pp. 3-13.

known events or fixed dates for these reigns, but it is clear that the reign of Azes II extended into the beginning of the 1st century A.D. Meanwhile, a Parthian feudal family, soon to be known as the dynasty of the Indo-Parthians, was pursuing the migrating Sakas up the valley of the Helmand, and down into the Punjab. Stage by stage the Indo-Scythian empire of the Sakas was conquered by the advancing Indo-Parthians, upon the coins of whom appear such names as Gondophares, Orthagnes, Abdagases, Pacores and Sasan, besides a certain Arsaces Theos whose connections are uncertain. Various problems arise concerning the exact sequence of the Indo-Parthian rulers, but the date of Gondophares is firmly established by the Takht-i Bahī inscription of the year 103,¹ which is also dated to the twenty-sixth year of Gondophares' reign. The first date must be reckoned according to the "era of Azes" (57 B.C.) and therefore corresponds to A.D. 46, whilst the accession year of Gondophares was consequently A.D. 20. These are dates which appear the more convincing because they agree with the only other information preserved about the emperor Gondophares, which is his connection with the tale of the voyage of the Christian apostle Thomas to India. The tradition records that Thomas set out for India immediately after the Crucifixion, i.e. in April A.D. 30.² The appearance of Gondophares in the Acts of the Apostle Thomas is therefore chronologically acceptable, and serves to confirm the dating proposed for the inscription.

Meanwhile the Tochari and their associates the Asiani were pressing south from Tukhāristān through the passes of the Hindu Kush into the Kabul valley, and by the beginning of the 1st century A.D. were breaking out onto the Punjab plain. This was the time when the Asiani, i.e. the Kushāns, established themselves as the "rulers of the Tochari". These events are summed up in a well-known passage of the Chinese *Hou-Han shu*, which has been quoted by Konow:

Formerly the Yüe-chi were conquered by the Hiung-nu; they transferred themselves to the Ta-hia [i.e. Bactria] and divided that kingdom between five *hi-hou* [minor chiefs], viz., those of Hiu-mi, Shuang-mi, Kuei-shang, Hi-tun and Tu-mi.

More than a hundred years after this the *hi-hou* of the Kuei-shang, called K'iu-tsiu-k'io, attacked the other four *hi-hou*; he styled himself king; the name of his kingdom was Kuei-shang. He invaded An-si and seized the

¹ See Appendix IV, no. 12.

² Wright, *The Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles*, p. 146. A. T. Olmstead, "The chronology of Jesus' life", *Anglican Theological Review* xxiv. 1 (Evanston, Ill., 1942), p. 23.

HISTORY OF EASTERN IRAN

territory of Kao-fu; moreover he triumphed over Pu-ta and Ki-pin and entirely possessed those kingdoms. K'iu-tsiu-k'io died more than eighty years old. His son Yen-kao-chen became king in his stead.¹

This passage is interpreted as describing the establishment of the Kushān empire under Kujula Kadphises, and the eventual succession to the throne of his son Vima Kadphises. The Takht-i Bahī inscription is often thought to contain a mention of the Kushān prince Kujula Kadphises, whose rule over the Yüeh-chih horde will thus have begun early in the Christian era, and necessarily before A.D. 46.

THE KUSHĀN EMPIRE

The Kushān empire founded by Kujula Kadphises was soon to expand on both sides of the Hindu Kush, and to become for more than a century the most influential civilizing force in Asia. To the south the Kushāns thrust forward to dominate the north Indian plain, establishing their centres at Peshawar and at Mathurā (Muttra), and even penetrating for a time into the basin of the Ganges. To the north, still conscious of their nomad origins, the Kushāns sought to restore contact with the Chinese borderlands in which their wanderings had begun. No doubt their great resources in animal transport as a nomadic people gave them the means to set the Chinese trade flowing, and to form a bridge between the civilizations of India and China. At the same time the fact that in Bactria they were the successors of a Hellenistic civilization gave them special points of contact with the Mediterranean world. The staple item in the westbound trade was of course silk, which could now avoid Parthian territory and be diverted southwards to the Indus delta, to finish its journey to the Roman empire by sea. In return, besides gold coin, Rome sent manufactured goods of many kinds – woollen tapestries, engraved gems and cameos, figurines and metalware; but perhaps most important of all, the magnificent glassware of Alexandria, since China in the 1st century A.D. had not developed the manufacture of glass. At the same time the Indian territories of the Kushāns exported both towards China and to Italy their exquisite ivories. For all this trade the French excavations at Begram in Afghanistan have proved the most revealing source of information, but minor finds are known from many sites.

The complexity of the migration in which the Kushāns took part and

¹ *Kharoshthi Inscriptions*, pp. lvi, lxii. [For further detail see chapter 6, III. For alternative spelling of some of the names see p. 246.]

the variety of the tribes which accompanied them naturally raise many difficult problems of race and language. So far as the ruling group were concerned, their drooping moustaches and bulbous features, as frequently depicted in the sculpture of Gandhara, or on the coins, have caused many commentators to doubt, perhaps with insufficient reason, that they could have been Indo-Europeans. Kennedy argued eloquently that they represented a Turkish, or at any rate non-Iranian physical type.¹ The medieval Arab writer al-Bīrunī regarded them as Tibetans;² whilst their contemporary, the Syrian Bardesanes in his *Book of the Laws of the Countries*,³ reports the existence of matriarchal tendencies in their society. At the same time their dress and equipment – the buckled cloak, long shirt, and the baggy trousers of the horseman, depicted in many works of Gandhara sculpture, and especially on the statue of the emperor Kanishka from Mathurā (pl. 79) – were no different from that of the other Iranians of the steppe. Like the Sakas they wore scale-armour, and their weapons included a straight sword over three feet long.

It is not known whether the Kushāns possessed a special language, distinct from that of their associated tribes. However, it is now clear that the official language of the Kushān empire, an Iranian dialect written in Greek script, is in fact Bactrian – that is, the local eastern Iranian dialect of the province in which the Kushāns had settled after crossing the Oxus. This language is now known from the inscriptions of a large part of the Kushān coinage, and especially from the twenty-five-line lapidary “Inscription of Nokonzoko” discovered by the Délégation Archéologique Française en Afghanistan at Surkh Kotal, and interpreted by the late Professor W. B. Henning.⁴ It seems likely that this adaptation of the Greek script for the writing of the Bactrian language had already been carried out by the Greeks in Bactria before the coming of the Kushāns, since the devices employed for the rendering of the specifically Iranian sounds are entirely of the type that would occur to the Greek mind; e.g., the rendering of the aspirate by upsilon (since in Greek initial upsilon invariably carries the rough breathing), and of the *ś* sibilant by *san*. It is also curious that the “Inscription of Nokonzoko” contains one word in common with the Khotanese texts of Central Asia. This is the Bactrian *𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌*, Khotanese *kṣuna* – “regnal year” – but it remains to be determined in what dialect this word originated.

¹ J. Kennedy, “The Secret of Kanishka”, *JRAS* 1912, p. 670.

² *India*, II, tr. E. Sachau (London, 1910), pp. 10–13.

³ Ed. and tr. H. J. W. Drijvers (Assen, 1964), p. 47.

⁴ Henning, “The Bactrian Inscription”, p. 47. [See also chapter 36. Ed.]

The next group in the tribal hierarchy after the Kushāns were the Tocharians, but of their language no trace survives in Bactria. Some scholars are inclined to attribute to the Tocharians the two Indo-European *centum* dialects found in manuscript fragments from Kucha and Qarashahr. However, though there is a possibility that one or both of these dialects may have been connected with that of the migrating Tocharians, it seems clearer until positive proof comes to hand to designate them Agnaean and Kuchaeen, rather than to fore-judge the question by terming them "Tocharian A and B". A rather similar problem arises in connection with the dialect of the Sakas in India. Words and names attributable to them are found on the Indian coins and inscriptions, and have been variously connected. Thus the name of the Saka satrap Caṣṭana has been compared with the modern Pashto word *tsaxtan* "master", suggesting a connection between Pashto and the Indo-Scythian dialect. On the other hand such Indo-Scythian words as *horamurta* "supervisor of donations" and *bakanapati* "priest" have been compared with Khotanese.¹ Yet since Pashto and Khotanese are not closely related, the linguistic situation in the Kushān empire must have been more complex than at first appears.

Over the chronology of the Kushān empire much controversy prevails, but a definitive solution may now be within reach. The relative chronology of the rulers can be deduced from their coins, and is fairly well agreed. Starting in the first decades of the Christian era, there ruled Kujula Kadphises, then a "nameless king", designated on coins merely by his title, Soter Megas "The Great Saviour", and Vima Kadphises. The next series of coins provides the names of three further rulers, Kanishka (Kaniṣka) I, Huvishka (Huviṣka) and Vāsudeva. However, the absolute chronology of these reigns, and our knowledge of several minor members of the dynasty who did not strike coins, has to be deduced by assembling the evidence of a large number of dated inscriptions, some in Kharoṣṭhī and others in Brahmi script, from various sites in the subcontinent. To these must now be added the two dated Bactrian inscriptions from Surkh Kotal in Afghanistan. Complications arise in the study of the inscriptions from the fact that several different eras are used for dating. To devise a chronological scheme, the eras have first to be identified. In fact, the best hypothesis

¹ For *horamurta*, *horamrṇḍaga*, *horakaparivara*, in the Indo-Scythian inscriptions, see Konow, *Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions*, pp. cxviii, 148, H. W. Bailey, "Languages of the Saka", p. 136, and Lüders, *Mathurā Inscriptions*, p. 96.

assumes the existence of four quite different eras, all probably originating from the accession years of dynastic founders, on the following lines:

- (a) An Indo-Bactrian era of c. 155 B.C. (often called the Old Saka era).
- (b) The era of Azes commencing in 57 B.C.
- (c) The Śaka era, used originally by the western satraps of Ujjain, commencing in A.D. 78.
- (d) The era of Kanishka, c. A.D. 128.

The epigraphical evidence on which this scheme is based is given in Appendix iv.

It is necessary to take note at this point of the newly discovered Kushān trilingual inscriptions near the plain of Dasht-i Nāvur to the south-west of Kabul. Once described by Paul Bernard as the "Rosetta Stone" of Kushān archaeology, they prove to have been sadly defaced, and to raise now quite as many problems as they solve. Besides the versions in Greek-letter Bactrian, and in Kharoṣṭhī, the third text is in an unknown script showing affinities with Kharoṣṭhī, but of which the language is quite unknown; amongst other possibilities, it could of course be that of the Kushān dynasty themselves (see above, p. 199). Though the content of the inscriptions is problematical, the date at least seems to be perfectly clear, being the month Gorpaios of the year 279.¹ The present writer had argued elsewhere² the case for attributing this date to Tarn's "Old Saka" era (better perhaps Indo-Bactrian era) of 155 B.C., which provides the solution $279 - 155 = \text{A.D. } 124$. The ruler named at Dasht-i Navor is apparently Vima Kadphises, and this once more is in agreement with the present writer's prediction that the accession of Kanishka (I) should be placed either in A.D. 128 or A.D. 125. Unfortunately the editor of the inscription felt unable to accept so simple a conclusion, being determined to uphold the chronology which places the accession of Kanishka in A.D. 78. If Tarn's "Old Saka" era of 155 B.C. is accepted for the calculation of the new date, the inscription of Dasht-i Navor itself proves (as was evident from material previously known) that so early a date for Kanishka would be impossible. Professor Fussman sought an escape from this dilemma by attempting to refer the new inscription, together with all the inscriptions previously known which are ascribed to the "Old Saka" era, instead to the Arsacid era of 247 B.C. It is by no means

¹ Fussman, "Documents épigraphiques Kouchans", esp. pp. 38-40.

² "The Kanishka Dating from Surkh Kotal", p. 501.

the first time this solution has been proposed for the inscriptions of Gandhara, and earlier refutations of the resulting chronology are of course still valid. First, on this calculation the solution of the Dasht-i Navor date would be $279 - 247 = \text{A.D. } 32$. This solution places Vima Kadphises earlier indeed than the latest firm date for Gondophares, that of the Takht-i Bāhī inscription, $103 - 57 = \text{A.D. } 46$. The date of Gondophares is the sheet-anchor for any reliable theory of early Indian chronology. Any serious student of the numismatic sequence would find it hard to believe that the fine gold coinage of Vima coexisted with the billon of Gondophares, or that the two rulers were contemporaries and neighbours.

There is, however, an even stronger objection to the "Arsacid" theory. Professor Fussman scouts as baseless Tarn's argumentation¹ that an important era began in 155 B.C. or thereabouts. Yet that argument was necessary to account for the date 78 in the celebrated copper-plate of Patika.² This document mentions the Saka emperor Moga, who is certainly identical with the ruler Maues known from coins, and with a deceased ruler named as Muki, again found in association with Patika on the Mathurā lion-capital.³ It is evident from the numismatic sequence⁴ that Maues must have lived one or two decades earlier than Azes I, the founder of the "Vikrama" era of 57 B.C. The coins also show that Maues must have come to power later than the Indo-Greek kings such as Archebius, who were ruling c. 110–100 B.C. These requirements are satisfactorily met by Tarn's solution. The Patika copper-plate is then dated $155 - 78 + 1 = 78 \text{ B.C.}$; and the Maira inscription of year 58, which possibly also mentions Maues, would fall in $155 - 58 + 1 = 98 \text{ B.C.}$ ⁵ These are perfectly plausible dates in the reign of Maues, and provide their own justification for Tarn's point of departure.

On the other hand, if one seeks to apply the Arsacid era to the Patika copper-plate, the resulting figures bear no relation to probability. Thus $247 - 78 + 1 = 170 \text{ B.C.}$, which would make of Maues a contemporary of Eucratides, and run counter to all the logic of the numismatic sequence. Professor Fussman does not explain in his article, how, on his hypothesis, he would account for the copper-plate of Patika. The only escape from the dilemma would be to assume the existence of some further era, specifically to accommodate the copper-

¹ Tarn, *Greeks in Bactria and India*, p. 501.

² *CII* II, pt. i, pp. 23–9.

³ *CII* II, pt. i, p. 48.

⁴ Jenkins, "Indo-Scythic Mints", p. 15.

⁵ *CII* II, pt. i, p. 12.

plate. After this the question arises of how the remaining inscriptions are to be distributed between this hypothetical era, and that of the Arsacids. It is evident, therefore, that the "Arsacid theory" leads to various anomalies, and finally to a labyrinth of special pleading. The present writer must be forgiven if he prefers to regard the evidence of Dasht-i Navor as providing long-awaited confirmation of his earlier reasoning, and of the traditional chronological framework maintained by Sir John Marshall and others before him, who placed the accession date of Kanishka in the range A.D. 125-8.

The list of inscriptions makes clear the evidence for the dating of the principal Kushān kings, and shows that in addition to the rulers known from coins, there were two more ephemeral Kushān kings, Vāsishka and a possible Kanishka II, whose reigns are known only from the inscriptions. The demise of the last major Kushān emperor, Vāsudeva, appears to have taken place around A.D. 225. This is an impressive coincidence of dates, when it is borne in mind that the overthrow of the Kushān empire has often been attributed to the Sasanian dynasty of Iran, whose founder, Ardashīr I, defeated and slew the last Parthian king, Ardavān V, and was acknowledged as emperor of Iran in A.D. 224. According to the Arab historian Ṭabarī,¹ Ardashīr shortly afterwards undertook a campaign against the empire of the Kushāns, and won a notable victory, as a result of which the Kushān king sent messengers to offer submission. During the subsequent reign, that of the Sasanian Shāpūr I (A.D. 240-72), the son of Ardashīr I, it is evident from the inscription on the monument called the Ka'ba-yi Zardusht at Naqsh-i Rostam, near Persepolis, that the Sasanians directly ruled all the territories of the Kushān empire as far east as, if not including, the city of Peshawar.² This was the former capital of Kanishka I, and it is therefore clear that the advent of the Sasanians put an end to the days of Kushān grandeur. However, it is not improbable that one or two lesser Kushān kings, whose existence is vaguely hinted at by the evidence, may have continued to rule over those fragments of the Kushān empire which lay to the east of the river Indus. In particular, it appears that there are coins which can be attributed to a third Kanishka, who was apparently a successor of Vāsudeva. Thus it is not improbable that some of the inscriptions which give the name of Kanishka, and bear dates between 1 and 22, may in

¹ Nöldeke, *Ṭabarī*, p. 17. *Ta'rikh al-rusul wa'l-mulūk* 1, ed. M. J. de Goeje *et al.* (15 vols., Leiden, 1879-1901), 819.

² Maricq, "Res gestae", 306, 350.

fact be due to this third Kanishka, and dated by his regnal years. However, only a close study of the palaeography and sculptural style of monuments bearing the name of Kanishka is likely to reveal which, if any, of these is attributable to this later Kanishka III.

Kanishka I is in any event by far the best known and most celebrated member of the Kushān dynasty. Despite the absence of any narrative history of his reign, which is known principally from coins and inscriptions, certain facts emerge from the legends which surround his name. It is unlikely that as Buddhist sources allege Kanishka was himself a convert to Buddhism, for his foundation of a dynastic fire temple at Surkh Kotal in Afghanistan suggests that the state religion of the Kushāns was a form of Mazdaism.¹ Yet the appearance of the figure of Buddha on one of Kanishka's coins confirms that this emperor was at any rate sympathetic to the Buddhists, as the Buddhist tradition maintains. There is evidently truth in the story that the emperor founded the famous Kanishka monastery and *stūpa* at Peshawar, for the remains of the *stūpa* have been excavated and the relic casket found in it bears a Kharoṣṭhī inscription recording it as the gift of Kanishka.² Also linked with the memory of Kanishka was the Third Buddhist Council, convened in Kashmir, or according to another version at Jalandhara, to prepare commentaries on the canonical Buddhist texts.

The literary and intellectual activity of Kanishka's reign is prominent in the Buddhist traditions of China and Tibet, and must not pass unnoticed. Most of its outstanding personalities are associated with the Third Buddhist Council,³ or with its leading participants. Outstanding was its convener Parśva, and its president Vasumitra, who together supervised the compilation of the important commentary on the canonical texts, the *Mahāvibhāṣa*. The preparation of such commentaries, rather than mere selection of the canon, is quoted as a major aim of the Council. At the same time, a passage of its text weighs against this synchronism of the *Mahāvibhāṣa* with Kanishka, by referring to the past a miracle of that reign.⁴

More celebrated for his creative achievement than those religious organizers (with whom he is closely linked) was the poet and dramatist

¹ [See pp. 847ff. for a discussion of the religious beliefs of the Kushāns.]

² See Appendix IV, no. 24.

³ E. Frauwallner, "Die buddhistischen Konzile", *ZDMG* CII (1952), 250-6; T. Watters, *On Yuan-Chwang's Travels in India* (London, 1904-5), pp. 270-8; E. Zürcher, "The Yüeh-Chih and Kaniṣka in the Chinese Sources", in Basham (ed.), *Papers*, pp. 379-82. For the Buddhist background in general, see especially Lamotte, *Histoire du Bouddhisme indien*.

⁴ Zürcher, *op. cit.*, p. 387.

Aśvaghoṣa,¹ best known as the author of the life of the Buddha called the *Buddhacarita*. Also regarded as authentic is his classical drama *Śariputrāprakaraṇa*, known from Central Asian fragments,² and the poetical work *Saundaranandakāvya*,³ wherein is described the conversion of the Buddha's half-brother Nanda, and of which the colophon contains apparently reliable biographical details of the author. Other works attributed to Aśvaghoṣa are, however, of disputed authorship. The *Sūtrālamkāra*, which contains references to the Kushān emperor, and was believed by Lévi to be the work of the Buddhist patriarch,⁴ is nowadays considered by some to be more properly entitled the *Kalpanāmaṇḍitikā*, and to have in fact been compiled by the somewhat later author Kumaralāta.⁵ A number of other Buddhist writings, such as the *Gurupañcāśika* ("Fifty verses on the rules for serving one's teacher"),⁶ the *Gaṇḍistotra* (on the music produced from a type of xylophone),⁷ the *Vajrasūcī* ("the Diamond Needle", a criticism of the caste system), the *Mahāyana-śraddhotpādaśāstra* (on the Awakening of Faith in the Mahāyana doctrine),⁸ and others known chiefly from their Chinese versions, are usually attributed to later namesakes, and thought to allude to doctrinal differences of the late medieval period, although traditionally ascribed to the Kanishkan patriarch. Different authorities acknowledge the existence of three, or even six, authors named Aśvaghoṣa in various periods, and at least two rulers known from coins and inscriptions seem to have borne this name. For the historical personage with whom we are concerned, the most reliable tradition is that he was born at Saketa, son of Suvarṇakṣī.

Even though it can be contended that the Buddhist teacher was not identical with the poet and dramatist,⁹ it seems over-sceptical to doubt

¹ E. H. Johnstone, *The Buddhacarita*, Part II (Oxford, 1936), pp. xiii-xcviii (Punjab University Oriental Publications, 2); B. C. Law, *Aśvaghoṣa*, Calcutta, 1946 (RASB Monograph series, 1); *Encyclopaedia of Buddhism*, ed. G. P. Malalasekera, s.v. Aśvaghoṣa; F. Weller, *Zwei zentralasiatische Fragmente des "Buddhacarita"*, Berlin, 1953; Dobbins, *Stupa*, p. 38.

² Heinrich Lüders, "Das S., ein Drama des Aśvaghoṣas", *SPAW* 1911, pp. 388-411.

³ E. H. Johnstone, *The "Saundarananda" of Aśvaghoṣa*, Oxford (Punjab University Oriental Publications no. 1), 1928.

⁴ Sylvain Lévi, "Aśvaghoṣa, le Sūtrālamkāra et ses sources", *JA* 1908, pp. 57-184, esp. pp. 62, 79.

⁵ H. Lüders, *Bruchstücke der "Kalpanāmaṇḍitikā" des Kumaralāta*, Leipzig, 1926. Contra, Lévi, "Encore Aśvaghoṣa", *JA* 1928, p. 196.

⁶ S. Lévi, "Autour d'Aśvaghoṣa", *JA* 1929, pp. 256-63.

⁷ F. W. Thomas, "A new poem of Aśvaghoṣa", *JRAS* 1914, pp. 752-3.

⁸ Tr. M. Teitaro Suzuki, Chicago, 1900. Cf. P. Demiéville, "Sur l'authenticité du 'Ta tch'eng k'i sin louen'", *Bulletin de la Maison Franco-Japonaise* II. 2 (Tokyo, 1929), p. 65.

⁹ So A. K. Warder, "The Possible Dates of Parśva, Vasumitra (II), Caraka and Mātṛceta", in Basham, *Papers*, p. 238.

his conversion to Buddhism by Parśva, or by the disciple of the latter, Puṇyayaśas (Pūrṇāśa).¹ An important Khotanese text represents Aśvaghoṣa as the spiritual adviser of Kanishka in Buddhist matters, and as having played a part in the popularization of the Buddha image.² Since it may now be taken as demonstrated³ that the appearance of the Gandhara school of Buddhist sculpture (and approximately simultaneous developments at Mathurā) in the main belong to the opening years of Kanishka's reign, the relation of Aśvaghoṣa and his circle to this movement needs to be analysed. It could be conceived that the stereotyped iconography found at northern Buddhist sites many miles apart could have been inspired by illustrated copies of such texts as the *Buddhacarita*. The recent discussion by Dagens,⁴ concerned only with limited material from Hadda, in fact concedes that certain sculptures correspond to the narrative of the *Buddhacarita*, though the *Lalita-vistara* appears to have been the more influential source.

Although the Tibetan *History of Buddhism* by Tāranātha appears to identify with Aśvaghoṣa the scholar Mātṛceṭa, the evidence now seems stronger that the latter author belonged to a later generation. The fact that he is known for his epistle to a ruler named Kanishka, the *Mahārājakanikalekhā*,⁵ wherein he excuses his inability to travel to court on account of his advanced age, had been thought to link him with the generation of Aśvaghoṣa. Against this, however, must be reckoned the well-supported tradition that Mātṛceṭa was converted to Buddhism from the cult of Śiva at Nālandā by Āryadeva, the disciple of Nāgārjuna (the personality next to be discussed).⁶ Nāgārjuna was himself a younger contemporary of Kanishka's generation, so that this chain of evidence suggests a significant lapse of time. At the same time, there is separate epigraphic and numismatic evidence for the existence of two rulers bearing the name of Kanishka, and some commentators have even concluded that there were altogether three Kushān rulers of that name. The Kanishka mentioned in the Ārā inscription dated in the year 41 is traditionally referred to the era of

¹ Lévi, "Encore Avaghoṣa", p. 199.

² H. W. Bailey, "Kanaiska", *JRAS* 1942, pp. 20-1. A similar tradition is reported by S. Lévi, "Notes sur les Indo-Scythes", *JA* 1896, p. 475.

³ A traditional view, for which the arguments of Bivar, "Hāriti and the Chronology of the Kuṣāṇas", p. 18 are now emphatically substantiated by the newly discovered sculpture in Fussman, "Documents épigraphiques kouchans", pp. 54-5.

⁴ B. Dagens, *Monuments préislamiques d'Afghanistan*, p. 1529; p. 17243.

⁵ F. W. Thomas, "Mātṛceṭa and the Mahārājakanikalekha", *IndAnt* xxxiii (1903), 356-60.

⁶ D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *The "Śatapāñcāśatka" of Mātṛceṭa*, (Cambridge, 1951), pp. 7-9.

the first Kanishka, though account must now be taken of MacDowall's interesting suggestion that this date should be referred to an era of A.D. 78 coinciding with the Śaka era of western India.¹ If his hypothesis is well founded, the Ārā inscription will no longer be evidence for the existence of a second Kanishka. Thus the Kanishka known from later Kushān ("Murūṇḍa") coins will be Kanishka II, reigning c. A.D. 225. On the traditional interpretations, the last-named ruler would be Kanishka III. In either event, it would be reasonable to place the *floruit* of Nāgārjuna c. A.D. 155 and of Āryadeva c. A.D. 185, and thus connect the epistle of Mātṛceta with this last Kanishka in the advanced years of the sage c. A.D. 225.

The list of the thirteen known literary works of Mātṛceta is given by Shackleton Bailey.² Apart from his famous epistle, he was best known for his Buddhist hymns, in particular the *Śatapañcāśatka* ("The Hymn of 150 Verses"), and the *Varṇārḥavarṇastotra*,³ both of which have been edited. The consensus of recent opinion is thus fairly clear that Mātṛceta was a personage quite distinct from Aśvaghoṣa, and significantly later in date,⁴ and moreover that his celebrated epistle is no evidence for placing him in the circle of Kanishka I c. A.D. 128–51. Traditionally reckoned, however, the court physician of that emperor was Caraka, known especially for his redaction of the herbal pharmacopoeia of Agniveśa current under the title of *Caraka Saṁhitā*, published in India in several editions. Also most important for his historical synchronism in this literary circle was Saṅgharakṣa, likewise reckoned one of the first Kanishka's spiritual guides in Buddhism, who was also the author of a *Buddhacarita* apparently distinct from that of Aśvaghoṣa, and especially of the *Yogācārabhūmi*.⁵ The chronological importance of the latter work is that it is known to have been translated into Chinese before A.D. 148,⁶ so that while it supports earlier dates for the accession of Kanishka I, such as A.D. 128 or A.D. 78, it necessarily excludes some of the later dates which have been propounded.

¹ MacDowall, "Implications for Kushan Chronology", p. 259.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 1.

³ Shackleton Bailey, "The Varṇārḥavarṇa Stotra of Mātṛceta (I)", *BSOAS* XIII (1950), pp. 671–701; "(II)", *ibid.*, pp. 948–1003. B. Pauly, "Fragments Sanskrits de Haute Asie (Mission Pelliot): XVIII. Matériaux pour une édition définitive du *Varṇārḥavarṇastotra* de Mātṛceta", *JA* 1964, pp. 197–271.

⁴ Shackleton Bailey, "*Satapañcāśatka*", p. 15.

⁵ P. Demiéville, "La Yogācārabhūmi de Saṅgharakṣa", *BEFEO* XLIV (1954), 339–436; P. C. Baghchi, "Saṅgharakṣa, the chaplain of Kanishka", in *Commemoration Essays Presented to Professor K. B. Pathak* (Poona, 1934), pp. 94–9.

⁶ Zürcher in Basham, *Papers*, p. 356.

Already noticed as a younger contemporary of the personages discussed above was Nāgārjuna, traditionally the founder of the Mādhyamika school of Mahāyāna Buddhism.¹ It is likely to be the case that the distinction between the two main branches of Buddhist belief may have been less sharp in the 2nd century A.D. than it later became, and that the life of Nāgārjuna may in later sources have been subject to some reinterpretation in the light of later controversies. In any event his chief work seems to have been the transmission of developed Buddhist doctrines to the Śātavāhana kingdom of the Deccan. It is plausibly argued that he could have been the contemporary of the ruler Vasiṣṭiputra Śrī Pulumāvi (c. A.D. 130–58); and that he took part in works of restoration of the monuments at Amarāvati (the ancient Dhānyakāṭaka) which bear the inscriptions of that prince.² Certainly the Buddha image which appears in the late phase of the sculptures of Amarāvati is often strongly reminiscent of Gandhara work, and could owe something to contacts with the Kushān centres. Yet in discussing such panels in the British Museum, Barrett was hesitant in attributing their inspiration to Nāgārjuna.³ The sage is remembered for his epistle to an unnamed Śātavāhana ruler (presumably Pulumāvi) the *Suhrillekha*, preserved in Chinese versions and in Tibetan.⁴ Its title, “Epistle to a Friend”, may be evidence of his personal relationship with the ruler. In addition he left philosophical works: the *Mahāprajñāpāramitāsāstra* (“The Treatise of the Great Virtue of Wisdom”), recently translated from the Chinese;⁵ the *Mahāyānavimśikā*,⁶ and the *Vigrahavyāvartanī*.⁷ There seems no reason to abandon the tradition which represents him as ending his days at the great archaeological site of Nāgārjunakoṇḍa which inherited his name.⁸

Another episode of the reign of Kanishka was the emperor’s campaign

¹ For the life of Nāgārjuna in general, see Warder, *Indian Buddhism*, pp. 374ff; on the rise of the Mahāyāna, E. Lamotte, “Sur la formation du Mahāyāna”, in J. Schubert and U. Schneider (eds), *Asiatica: Festschrift F. Weller* (Leipzig, 1954), pp. 377–96 and esp. 387–8.

² Warder in Basham, *Papers*, pp. 333–4.

³ D. Barrett, *Sculptures from Amaravati in the British Museum* (London, 1954), p. 59 and pl. xxix.

⁴ Sylvain Lévi, “Kaniška et Śātavāhana”, *JA* 1936, 107–11; the Tibetan text was translated by H. Wenzel, *Journal of the Pali Text Society* (1886), pp. 1–32.

⁵ Nāgārjuna, *Le Traité de la grande vertu de sagesse*, tr. by E. Lamotte, 3 vols., Louvain, 1944. Vol. III, viii–xlv, contains a useful biographical note on Nāgārjuna.

⁶ Giuseppe Tucci, *Minor Buddhist Texts* (Rome, 1956), 195–200. (Serie Orientale Roma, 9.)

⁷ Ed. E. H. Johnstone and A. Kunst, Bruges, 1951.

⁸ A. H. Longhurst, *The Buddhist Antiquities of Nāgārjunakoṇḍa*, Delhi 1938 (Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India, 54).

in eastern Turkestan, mentioned by the Chinese traveller Hsüan-Tsang in his account of the “monastery of the hostages” founded by Kanishka at Kapisa.

Surely to be connected with this Kushān penetration into the Tarim basin are the famous frescoes in pure Gandhara style discovered by Sir Aurel Stein at Miran. The close resemblance between the frieze of *putti* in the frescoes and that appearing on the Kanishka casket from Peshawar supports the deduction that both works belong to the lifetime of Kanishka. The Miran site will therefore be evidence of Kushān activity in the Tarim basin. It may be concluded that the far-reaching political sovereignty of Kanishka helped to secure a right-of-way for Buddhist travellers along the route to China. Not only did they introduce their characteristic Gandhara art at Miran, they also brought with them their Kharoṣṭhī script, which occurs in the Tarim basin in the documents from Niya, near Khotan, and in others from Endere and Lou-Lan. It was also used for writing works of Buddhist scripture, of which an example survives in the *Gāndhārī Dharmapada*, edited by Professor J. Brough.

LATE ANTIQUITY IN EASTERN IRAN

After the fall of the Kushān dynasty in A.D. 225, the provinces of Gandhara, Bactria and Sogdiana passed under the rule of Sasanian governors who bore the title of Kūshānshāh “King of the Kushāns”. This Persian administration continued until about A.D. 360. The Kūshānshāhs are known chiefly from their coinage, which resembles that of the Sasanian empire of Iran in distinguishing the individual rulers each by his characteristic crown. Unlike the Sasanian coinage in Iran, however, the coinage of the Kūshānshāhs comprised little silver (only two isolated silver issues, of Pērōz I Kūshānshāh, and Hormizd I Kūshānshāh, are known) and was practically limited to issues in gold and bronze. The sequence of the Kūshānshāhs whose coins are known is given in the following list [cf. pp. 334, 339]:

Ardashīr I Kūshānshāh

Ardashīr II Kūshānshāh

Pērōz I Kūshānshāh

Hormizd I Kūshānshāh (c. A.D. 277–86; rebel against Bahrām II of Iran)

Pērōz II Kūshānshāh

Hormizd II Kūshānshāh (? subsequently Hormizd II of Iran,
A.D. 302–9)

Varahrān I Kūshānshāh

Varahrān II Kūshānshāh (reigning A.D. 360).

References to the Kūshānshāhs in the historical sources are rare, but the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae* (Carus 8) mention that during the advance of the Roman emperor Carus against the Persian capital of Ctesiphon in A.D. 283, the Persians were “occupied with domestic sedition”, and therefore offered no opposition to the advancing Romans. Moreover, a Roman panegyric of the reign of Maximian (A.D. 285–305) describes how the Persian king, presumably Bahrām II (A.D. 276–93) was attacked by his brother “Ormies”, a name which could well designate the Kūshānshāh Hormizd I. The issue by Hormizd I Kūshānshāh at Marv of Sasanian-type gold coins with the title Kūshānshāhānshāh “Kushān king of kings” was thus in all probability an act of open rebellion.

It is none the less clear that Bahrām II of Iran was successful in defeating the rebellion of the Kūshānshāh. This is evidenced not only by his continued reign until A.D. 293, a full ten years after the earliest mention of the insurrection; but also by a passing notice of the historian Agathias¹ who states that Bahrām reduced the people of Segistan (Sistān) to subjection, and therefore conferred on his infant son the title of Sakānshāh. Though the rebellion of the Kūshānshāh is not specifically mentioned in this connection, it is natural to suppose that the reduction of the people of Segistan was accompanied by the overthrow of their neighbour the Kūshānshāh, with whom, according to the panegyric already quoted, they were in fact acting in concert.

The last possible reference in a western historian to the affairs of the Kushān governorate occurs in the description by Ammianus Marcellinus (xix. i. 1–2) of the siege by the Sasanian emperor Shāpūr II of the Roman city of Amida. According to Ammianus, the Persian king led his army on horseback, “wearing in the place of a diadem a golden replica of a ram’s head set with gems”. It has already been observed that each of the Sasanian kings was distinguished, on coins and in art, by a characteristic crown, which he no doubt also wore in real life. The headdress of Shāpūr II was a mural crown, and not one of the type described by Ammianus. It is true, however, that the characteristic headdress of Varahrān II Kūshānshāh, quite probably a contemporary of Shāpūr II, was in the form of a ram’s head. It seems likely, therefore,

¹ *Historici Graeci Minores*, p. 261.

that the Persian prince seen by Ammianus was not in fact Shāpūr, but the Kūshānshāh Varahrān II, who is thus shown to have been active in A.D. 360.

It is now time to turn to a new factor which began about A.D. 350 to impinge upon the history of the eastern Iranian lands. This was the coming of the Huns or Hsiung-nu (whose earlier history has already been noticed)¹ to the west from the borders of China. In A.D. 311 the southern section of the Hsiung-nu had captured and burnt the capital of the Chinese Tsin dynasty at Lo-yang, the terminus of the Silk Route famous to the Romans as Sera Metropolis. The disturbances which took place further to the west along the Silk Route as a consequence of this event are reflected in the Sogdian "Ancient Letters", found by Sir Aurel Stein in the Chinese Wall to the west of Tun-huang, and now in the British Museum.² In China the Hsiung-nu set up a dynasty which survived until A.D. 350. Meanwhile the northern section of the same people had been driven westwards from the vicinity of Lake Baikal by their rivals the Sien-pi. The Hsiung-nu apparently passed to the north of the Tien-shan range, where their movements were unknown to the historians of either half of the civilized world. It was only in A.D. 350 that their impact fell on the course of western history.

In that year Shāpūr II of Iran was besieging the Roman fortress of Nisibis in Mesopotamia when news reached him that the eastern frontiers of Iran were being attacked by nomadic invaders. He immediately abandoned the siege, and set out for the threatened spot. The historian Zonaras (II. 15) calls the invaders "Massagetae", and Ammianus Marcellinus (xiv. iii. 1) does not name them at this point in his narrative; but subsequently (xvi. ix. 4) it emerges that they were, in fact, the Chionites, a name formed from the Middle Persian word *xiyōn* "Hun", perhaps with the addition of a Greek tribal suffix. It is clear, therefore, that the invaders were a section of the Huns, who had lately arrived in Transoxiana in the course of their journey from the east. The struggle with these opponents kept the Sasanian king occupied until A.D. 358, when he was able to contract a treaty of peace with them, under which they were to join him as allies in a further campaign against Rome.

So it was that at the siege of Amida in A.D. 360 the Chionites under their king Grumbates were ranged amongst the allies of the Persians. A vivid detail which occurs in the narrative of Ammianus is that of

¹ See p. 191 above.

² Henning, "The date of the Sogdian Ancient Letters".

the cremation of Grumbates' son, who was killed in the fighting with the Romans. Since the Zoroastrian Persians of Shāpūr's army would have regarded cremation as anathema, it seems clear that this ritual was characteristic of the Chionites. Confirmation of Ammianus' statement comes in archaeological reports of cremation deposits found amongst the European Huns,¹ who will naturally have had affinities with the Chionites. At the same time there is evidence that some of the later Hunnish tribes in eastern Iran practised instead the rite of inhumation (see below).

Whereas the earlier Sasanian Kūshānshāhs had minted at Balkh (written *Baxlo* on the coins), as well as at an unnamed mint that was probably in the Kabul valley, it appears that Varahrān II Kūshānshāh, the contemporary of the Chionites, issued few coins at Balkh. The conclusion is that the Chionites, pressing down from the north, had already overrun Bactria. Shortly after A.D. 360, when the reign of Varahrān II Kūshānshāh came to an end, the next ruler to issue coins of Kushāno-Sasanian fabric was the enigmatic figure of Kidara. This personage was no doubt a Hun, to judge by the phrase "Kidarite Huns" used by the historian Priscus in a later context. Probably Kidara was a successor of Grumbates as ruler over the Chionites, who because of his leadership would have come to be known by his name. According to the Chinese sources followed by McGovern, a new wave of Hunnish invaders known as the Hephthalites fell upon Bactria towards the end of the 4th century, and drove the Kidarites into Gandhara. However, according to the thesis of Ghirshman, Chionites, Kidarites and Hephthalites were merely different names used at various periods for the same tribal group. The Chionites may indeed have been substantially identical with the later Kidarites, but there is support for the view that the Hephthalites were distinct in the passage of Procopius (*Wars*, I. 3) which describes the customs of the Hephthalites. Procopius claims that though Huns by name and race, the Hephthalites did not live as nomads; that they were of fair complexion and regular features; and that they practised inhumation of their dead, up to twenty of his boon companions being buried with each of their chiefs. In respect of their funeral rites, therefore, the customs of the Hephthalites contrast with those of the Chionites, and suggest that these two groups were wholly distinct.

¹ Cf. Nándor Fettich, "Le Trouvaille de tombe princière hunnique à Szeged-Nagyszéksós", *Archaeologia Hungarica* xxxii (Budapest, 1953), p. 105.

As to the language of the eastern Huns, just as in the case of the European Huns, no specimen survives, and scholars have disagreed in their theories as to the linguistic and racial background of this people. Ghirshman and Enoki,¹ on the basis of certain coin legends in cursive Greek script, maintained the hypothesis that the language of the Hephthalites was an Iranian dialect. However, this view seems to have been overtaken by the discovery of the inscriptions of Surkh Kotal (see above, p. 199), which show that the Iranian language in question was in fact the local dialect of Bactria, and not the language of the Huns themselves. The view of Minorsky, that the language of the Hephthalites was a Turkish dialect, therefore holds the field at present.² The case in its favour is much strengthened by the suggestion of Bosworth,³ that the personage called in Islamic texts "Subkarī" (a prominent Khaljī Mamlūk of the Ṣaffārid Ya'qūb), in fact bore the Turkish name of Sebük-eri "beloved man", formed similarly to that of the later Ghaznavid prince Sebūktigīn "beloved prince". The name "Subkarī" also appears on coins of Fārs, where he gained control during fighting following the decline of the Ṣaffārids, on dirhams of the Hijrī years 296–8.⁴ The only specimen so far reproduced is, however, one of the 'Umān mint in a Baghdad collection,⁵ where the editor is possibly mistaken in reading the poorly preserved date as A.H. 308 (rather than 298), since it is known from the *Tārīkh-i Sīstān* passage that this dangerous freelance was imprisoned by the caliph al-Muqtadir in Jumādā II 299/23 March–21 April 912, and is unlikely to have been restored to liberty.

Whether any linguistic difference existed between the Chionites, Kidarites and Hephthalites is quite uncertain, but Bailey has shown that their Persian and Indian neighbours distinguished between different groups as the Red Huns and White Huns respectively.⁶

¹ Ghirshman, *Les Chionites–Hephthalites*, p. 66; Enoki, "On the nationality of the Ephthalites", p. 56.

² Minorsky, "The Turkish Dialect of the Khalaj"; Frye and Sayili, "Turks in the Middle East before the Saljuqs", pp. 204–5, 207.

³ Bosworth, "The armies of the Ṣaffārids", p. 545, quoting *Tārīkh-i Sīstān*, p. 252. Cf. also Bosworth, "The Turks in the Islamic Lands", p. 9.

⁴ E. von Zambaur, *Die Münzprägungen des Islams* (Wiesbaden, 1968), p. 182 n 3.

⁵ Muḥammad Abul-Faraj al-'Ush, "Rare Islamic coins: Additions", in D. K. Kouymjian (ed.), *Near Eastern Numismatics, Iconography, Epigraphy and History: Studies in Honor of George C. Miles* (Beirut, 1974), p. 200.

⁶ "Hārahūna", pp. 12–16. [Bailey has, however, shewn that some of the words quoted by the Chinese from the language of the Hiung-nu (called *hyon* in Middle Persian) are of Iranian origin; see "The Hiung-nu word for sky", in *S. K. Chatterji Memorial Volume* (Calcutta, 1979), pp. 25ff. Ed.]

During the 5th century A.D. the Hephthalites became an important power in the territories of eastern Iran. It was to them that the Sasanian prince Pērōz applied for assistance to recover the throne of Iran from his brother Hormizd III in A.D. 457. With the help of his Hephthalite auxiliaries he was successful, but later he went to war with his erstwhile allies, and was captured and defeated by their king, called Akhshunwār by Ṭabarī, or Khushnavāz by Firdausī. On this occasion Pērōz obtained his release by leaving his son Kavād as a hostage; but later, after ransoming Kavād he returned to the attack, and charged his cavalry into a hidden ditch, to perish with all his men.

During the 5th and early 6th centuries A.D. Indian sources record a series of incursions into the Punjab and western India by a people known as the Hūṇas. These were evidently a branch of the eastern Huns, though the nature of their connection with the Hephthalites of Bactria is not entirely clear. Their coin legends often give the rulers of these Indian Huns the title “king of Zābul”, Zābul being apparently the name of a tribal grouping which was preserved in the toponymy of the Muslim period by the name of the district of Zābulistān, near Ghazna. In A.D. 458 the Gupta emperor of India, Skandagupta, had to resist an invasion of India by the Huns. However, after his death the Gupta empire disintegrated, and in A.D. 510 the Hūṇa chief Toramana established his rule over much of western India. His son and successor was the notorious Mihirakula, who ruled most of the Punjab in about A.D. 525, and when later repulsed from the Indian plains, continued to maintain himself in Kashmir. Mihirakula was succeeded by other Hūṇa kings, among whom were Khingila Narendraditya and Lakhana Udayaditya, besides a certain Purvaditya whose personal name is unknown. These reigns fell in the second half of the 6th century A.D., but though a recently discovered inscription now at Kabul¹ confirms that Khingila reigned for at least eight years, their exact dates are not recorded. The capitals of these later Zābulite kings are likely to have been in the territory of modern Afghanistan, perhaps either at Kabul, Ghazna or Gardīz.

Meanwhile the Sasanian emperor Khusrau I Anūshīrvān (A.D. 531–79) had resolved to end the menace to Iran of the Hephthalites and their incursions. He built lines of fortification on the Gurgān plain; one was the wall known today as Sadd-i Iskandar “Alexander’s barrier”, on the steppe north of Bandar-i Shāh and Gunbad-i Qābūs; the second

¹ Sircar, “Three Early Medieval Inscriptions”, pp. 45–7.

runs from the mountains to the sea near Bandar-i Gaz, and covers the eastward approach to Māzandarān. At the same time a branch of the Turkish nation had arrived on the Jaxartes steppes from their original home in Mongolia. Khusrau made an alliance with the Turkish Khān – called in the western sources Sinjibu or Silzibul – to crush the Hephthalites. Soon after A.D. 557 a fierce battle was fought between the confederates and the Hephthalites, the latter being totally defeated and dispersed. The lands of the Hephthalites were partitioned along the line of the Oxus, those to the north passing to the Turks, while those to the south of the river were retained by the Sasanians.

The political situation in the east of what is today Afghanistan at this time is rather more obscure. Coins are known of a prince, perhaps a Hephthalite, whose name is written in Pahlavī script as *npky MLK'*. Some specimens appear to bear the mint-name Andarāb, and others, without name of mint, may have been issued at Kabul. The occurrence of such coins in a hoard which includes many of the Sasanian Khusrau I Anūshīrvān suggests that *npky MLK'* may have been the contemporary of this king.¹ If so, a few semi-independent chiefs of Hephthalite origin may have continued to rule in the Kabul area, perhaps with the title of Kābul-shāh, during the closing years of the Sasanian dynasty. In the region of Bādghīs, to the north-east of Herat, groups of Hephthalite survivors retained their ethnic identity until the Arab invasions of the 7th century A.D., when they are described as offering a stubborn resistance under the leadership of a certain Tarkhān Nēzak. It was recently suggested by Harmatta² that the correct reading of the Pahlavī coin legend mentioned above should indeed be *nyčky MLK'*, “the regular Middle Persian orthography of the name Nēzak”, and thus identical with that of the opponent celebrated in the Arab annals. The reading is certainly feasible, and must be considered seriously; though whether the numerous coins are indeed as late in date as the actual opponent of the Arabs, or whether, as the author tends to imply, and the scanty numismatic evidence seems to suggest, the name would have been a hereditary title held by a succession of princes of whom the historical Tarkhān Nēzak was perhaps the last, is a problem still deserving investigation.

¹ Bivar, “A Sasanian Hoard from Hilla”, *NC* 1963, pp. 159 and 172 (no. 1).

² J. Harmatta, “Late Bactrian Inscriptions”, *AAntASH* xvii, 3–4 (1969) 408, 431. This reading has now been accepted by Richard N. Frye, “Napki Malka and the Kushano-Sasanians”, in Kouymjian (ed.), *Near Eastern Numismatics*, pp. 116–18, who lists the historical appearances of the Nēzak princes between A.D. 651 and 137/754.

At any rate, apart from the career of Tarkhān Nēzak, the powerful and numerous nation of the Hephthalites disappears from history after its overthrow by Khusrau Anūshīrvān. Those not exterminated in battle must have been largely assimilated to the surrounding east Iranian peoples. If it is thus to some extent true that the Ghilzai tribe of modern Afghanistan are (as has often been supposed)¹ the descendants of the Hephthalites, they are at any rate wholly Pashto-speaking at the present day, and marked by no real ethnic or linguistic, but rather by tribal and dialectal differences, from the neighbouring nomadic tribesmen of Afghanistan.

If, on the evidence detailed above (p. 213) it is conceded that a Turkish-speaking group of Hephthalite origin played a prominent role amongst the nomad tribal confederacies of Arachosia during the early Islamic period, a neat explanation appears to account for the fact that Turkish-speakers are not to be found in the area today. It may be supposed that during the Mongol invasion, the nomad groups under the command of the Khwārazmian prince Jalāl al-Dīn were split by the force of the onslaught. One section of the Khalaj, apparently containing the Turkish-speaking fraction, were detached from the Khwārazmian force,² and in the ensuing confusion could have been swept up in the mass of Turkish tribes in the invader's train. These would have been the Khalaj who later appeared at Marv after the destruction of the city, and assisted the Mongols in exterminating the few survivors of the earlier massacre.³ Thereafter as it seems from the narrative of Juvainī, they made off towards the west, and can only have been the founders of the Khaljī settlements still existing around Sāva and Tafrīsh in present-day Iran.⁴

At the same time, in the historical narratives of the Delhi Sultanate, "Khaljīs" are constantly mentioned as soldiers and mercenaries, besides being the founders of several dynasties. Clear evidence of their Pashto speech comes relatively late, but with regard to the Sultan Jalāl al-Dīn Fīrūz, founder of the Khalji dynasty (689/1290 to 695/1296), a good case has been made for his non-Turkish and Afghan background.⁵ The role of Pashto under the subsequent Delhi rulers has

¹ *Encyclopaedia of Islam*¹, s.v. Ghalzai.

² Minhāj al-Dīn, *Ṭabaqāt-i Nāṣirī*, ed. Ḥabībī (Kabul, 1344), II, 117, for the Khalaj in the army of Jalāl al-Dīn; II, 119 for the subsequent fragmentation of his followers.

³ Juvainī, *History of the World Conqueror*, tr. J. A. Boyle, I (Manchester, 1958), 168, with II, 464.

⁴ G. Doerfer *et al.*, *Khalaj Materials*, Bloomington, Ind., 1971.

⁵ Olaf Caroe, *The Pathans* (London, 1958), p. 129.

been insufficiently investigated, but the unpublished *Chishtiya-i bihishtiya*¹ has several references to the Jalwānī and Dotānī Afghans in the aftermath of Tīmūr's invasion, and their "Afghān" speech. It is difficult to doubt that in the Indo-Muslim Sultanates the designation "Khaljī" applied in the main, or even exclusively, to Pashto-speaking tribesmen of the Ghilzai, associated Lodī, and even entirely separate clans; while in Iran the term applies to an early stratum of the Turkish population. Such appears to be the solution of the notorious and long-debated "Khaljī question"; but only linguistic studies demonstrating the existence of loan-words in either direction between these two communities could prove the soundness of this historical interpretation.

Doerfer was not concerned to discuss a presumed historical connection of the Iranian Khalaj with Afghanistan, while from the eastern angle the study of Ghilzai Pashto has tended to languish in neglect, and the possible existence in that dialect of Khaljī Turkish loan-words remains untested. Nor does there seem to be research in progress into the traditions of residual communities of Afghan origin in Rohilkand which might throw light on these questions. One can only endorse the summing-up by Doerfer: "The Iranian Khalaj with whom we are concerned prove, according to Minorsky 435,² to have first been mentioned in a Timurid source in A.H. 806 (= A.D. 1403); they would appear, however, already to have established themselves in their present area of settlement at an earlier date, namely in Mongolian, perhaps even in Saljuq times. It would, to be sure, be interesting to look more closely at the history of the Iranian Khalaj; however, that is not our problem."³

Addendum: A lecture by J. E. van Lohuizen (now in press), propounds a persuasive solution to the residual uncertainties of Kushān chronology. The existence of a Kanishka II and III had long been probable, but their absolute datings debatable. Using recent evidence of coins with the name Vāsishka (BAZHPKO) in the style of the 3rd century A.D. (R. Göbl, "Vāsiška II, ein bisher unbekannter König der späteren Kušan", *AOAW* CII (1965), no. 16, pp. 293-4; *idem*, "Vāsiška, Vāskušana und Xodēšāh: weitere neufunde kušānischer Königsnamen", *AOAW* CXVI (1979), no. 4, p. 120), van Lohuizen identifies the Kanishka of the Ara inscription as Kanishka III, reigning late in the 3rd century A.D. His dating (year 41 \cong A.D. 269) would be in the era of the second Kanishka, commencing almost exactly 100 years after the first. All texts mentioning Huv'shka will be of the second Christian, or first Kushān century, and all mentioning Vāsishka of the third Christian, or second Kushān century. Separation of the dated inscriptions of Kanishka I and II, with concurrent numerical dates, can depend only on sculptural style, Sanskritized language, or the use of devolved letterforms, and requires much further work. The chronology of the foregoing chapter remains nevertheless largely valid for the trans-Indus region where Kanishka I was the most prominent Kushān ruler.

¹ Of 'Alā al-Dīn Muḥammad Chishtī Barnāwī, cf. C. A. Storey, *Persian Literature*, 1, 2, p. 1007, no. 1330. See, for example, fol. 59v of the Calcutta manuscript, Curzon 78.

² "The Turkish Dialect of the Khalaj", p. 435.

³ G. Doerfer, "Das Chaladsch – eine archaische Türksprache in Zentralpersien", *ZDMG* CXVIII (1968), 79.

HISTORY OF EASTERN IRAN
APPENDIX I

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF INDO-GREEK
AND INDO-SCYTHIAN RULERS

| BACTRIA | | INDIA | |
|-------------|--|---|---|
| | | PUSHKALAVATI | TAXILA |
| c. 247 B.C. | Diodotus I Diodotus II <i>House of Euthydemus</i> | | |
| | <i>House of Eucratides</i> | | |
| 208 B.C. | Euthydemus I Demetrius I Antimachus I Theus Agathocles Pantaleon Demetrius II Euthydemus II | Apollodotus I Antimachus I Nicephorus | |
| 155 B.C. | Eucratides II Soter Plato | Menander I Soter Eucratides I Megas Menander I Soter Zoilus I Dikaios Theophilus Nicias Lysias Philoxenus (?) Antialcidas Strato (Phase I) | |
| | End of Euthydemid dynasty in Bactria | | |
| c. 130 B.C. | Heliocles | Heliocles Strato (Phase II) Philoxenus (2nd reign) Strato and Agathocleia Hermaeus and Calliope Strato (Phase III) Hermaeus | Heliocles Menander II Dikaios Strato (Phase IV) Archebius Maues Apollodotus II Hippostratus Azes I Hippostratus Azes I Azilises Azes II |
| | Nomad invasion of Bactria | | |
| 58 B.C. | | | |

APPENDICES

APPENDIX II

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF INDO-SCYTHIAN AND INDO-PARTHIAN EMPERORS

INDO-SCYTHIAN EMPERORS

| | |
|-----------|--|
| 57 B.C. | Azes I Azilises Azes II |
| c. A.D. 2 | Fragmentation of the Indo-Scythic empire |
| A.D. 6 | Indravarma ruling in Avaca Aspavarma Sāsān |

INDO-PARTHIAN EMPERORS

| | |
|------------|---|
| A.D. 26-45 | Gondophares Abdageses Oithagnes Pacores Gondophares II (?) Sanabares |
|------------|---|

APPENDIX III

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF KUSHĀN KINGS AND EMPERORS

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Reigning A.D. 45 | Kujula Kadphises (contemporary of Gondophares west of the Indus) |
| Reigning c. A.D. 64-78 | Soter Megas (The Nameless King) |
| Reigning A.D. 126 | Vima Kadphises |
| A.D. 128-51 | Kanishka I |
| A.D. 151-5 | Vāsishka (did not issue coins) |
| A.D. 155-87 | Huvishka { Kanishka II (attested by inscriptions in A.D. 168 and 181) |
| A.D. 191-226 | Vāsudeva |
| After A.D. 226 | Kanishka III (Kushān survivor east of the Indus) |

APPENDIX IV

TABLE OF SIGNIFICANT INSCRIPTIONS

INSCRIPTIONS DATED IN THE "INDO-BACTRIAN" ERA OF C. 155 B.C.
(SOMETIMES CALLED THE "OLD SAKA" ERA) AND UNDATED INSCRIPTIONS
OF THE EARLY PERIOD

| NO. | SCRIPT | ERA | B.C. | DETAILS OF INSCRIPTION | PERSONALITIES NAMED |
|-----|-----------|--|------|---|--|
| 1 | Kharoṣṭhī | — | — | Shinkot casket of Menander N. G. Majumdar, <i>EI</i> xxiv (1937), 1. D. C. Sircar, <i>EI</i> xxvi (1942), 318. S. Konow, <i>EI</i> xxvii (1947), 52. R. B. Whitehead, <i>NC</i> 1944, p. 99. Narain, <i>The Indo-Greeks</i> , pl. vi | <i>mahārāja Minedra</i> , with added inscription of Vijayamitra, in the year 5 (? of his reign) |
| 2 | Khar. | 58 | 98 | Maira well slabs <i>CII</i> II, p. 11 | ? <i>Moa</i> (= <i>Maues</i>) <i>Note</i> : This reading is not dependable |
| 3 | Khar. | 78 | 78 | Taxila copper-plate of Patika <i>CII</i> II, p. 23 | <i>maharaja mahata Moga</i> (= <i>Maues</i>); Liaka Kusulaka, satrap of Chukhsha; Patika, son of Liaka |
| 4 | Khar. | Undated – 10–15 years later than no. 3 | | Mathurā lion-capital <i>CII</i> II, p. 30. Lüders, <i>List of Brahmi Inscriptions</i> | <i>Muki raya</i> (? = <i>Maues</i>); yuvaraja Kharaosta; mahakṣatrapa Rajula; kṣatrapa Śuḍasa, son of Rajula; mahakṣatrapa Kusuluka Patika; kṣatrapa Mevaki; kṣatrapa Khardaa |

| | | | A.D. | | |
|----|------------|-------|------|---|--|
| 5 | Khar. | 191 | 36 | Taxila vase of Jihonika <i>CII</i> II, p. 81 | Jihonika, satrap of Chukhsa; Manigula, father of Jihonika |
| 6 | Bactrian | 279 | 124 | Surkh Kotal altar base Bivar, <i>BSOAS</i> xxvi (1963), 498 | |
| 7 | Trilingual | 279 | 124 | Dasht-i Navor rock inscriptions G. Fussman, <i>BEFEO</i> lxi (1974), 22 | Vhama (= <i>Vima Kadphises</i>) |
| 8 | Khar. | (2)84 | 129 | Hashtnagar pedestal <i>CII</i> II, p. 119; reading of date emended from 384 | |
| 9 | Brahmi | 299 | 144 | Kankali Tila Jaina image R. D. Banerji, <i>IndAnt</i> xxxvii (1908), 33. Van Lohuizen-de Leeuw, <i>The Scythian Period</i> , p. 56. | Unnamed <i>mahārāja rājātirāja</i> |
| 10 | Khar. | 303 | 148 | Charsadda casket N. G. Majumdar, <i>EI</i> xxiv (1937), 8 | |

Note: Rajula and Śoḍasa, satraps of Mathura, are mentioned in several other inscriptions of which the dating is uncertain, viz. Rajula, Mora slab (H. Lüders, *EI* xxiv (1938), 194; *List* 14), undated; Śoḍasa, Mathura slab of Amohini (see below, no. 11) and Mathura stone slab (A. Cunningham *ASIR* III, 30; *List*, 82), undated.

INSCRIPTIONS DATED IN THE ERA OF AZES (KNOWN AS THE VIKRAMA ERA), 57 B.C.

| NO. | SCRIPT | ERA | B.C. | DETAILS OF INSCRIPTION | PERSONALITIES NAMED |
|-----|--------|--------------|-----------|--|--|
| 11 | Brahmi | 42 | 16 | Mathura slab of Amohini G. Bühler, <i>EI</i> II (1892), 199. <i>List</i> , 59. E. J. Rapson, "The Date of the Amohini Votive Tablet of Mathura", in <i>Indian Studies in Honor of Charles Rockall Lanman</i> (Cambridge, Mass., 1929), p. 49 | <i>mahākṣatrapa Śoḍāsa</i> |
| 12 | Khar. | 63 | A.D. 6 | Indravarma casket from Avaca H. W. Bailey, <i>JRAS</i> 1978, pp. 3-13 | Indravarma; <i>maharayasa Ayasa atidasa</i> |
| 13 | Khar. | 14 regnal | — | Seṇavarma gold scroll H. W. Bailey, <i>JRAS</i> 1980, pp. 21-29 | Seṇavarma, king of Oḍī; Bhadasena, Mediśasena, Vasusena, Uttarasena, Ayidasena, former kings of Oḍī; Sadaṣkaṇo, son of Kuyula Kataphśa, Great King, King of Kings |
| 14 | Khar. | 103 | 46 | Takht-i Bāhī slab <i>CII</i> II, p. 62 | <i>mahārāja Guduvhara; erjhuna Kapa</i> (? = Kujula Kadphises) |

| | | | | | | |
|-----|----|-------|------------------|------------------|--|---|
| 223 | 15 | Khar. | 122 | 65 | Panjtār stone <i>CII</i> II, p. 67 | <i>maharaja Gushana</i> (? = Soter Megas) |
| | 16 | Khar. | 134 | 77 | Kalawan copper-plate S. Konow, <i>EI</i> XXI (1932), 251. S. Konow, <i>JRAS</i> 1932, p. 949 | <i>ayasa</i> “in the era of Azes” |
| | 17 | Khar. | 136 | 79 | Taxila silver scroll <i>CII</i> II, p. 70 | <i>ayasa</i> “in the era of Azes”; <i>maharaja rajatiraja devaputra Khushana</i> (? = Soter Megas) |
| | 18 | Khar. | 184 or 187 | 127 or 130 | Khalatse boulder | <i>maharaja Uvima Kavthisa</i> (? = Vima Kadphises) |

Note: This inscription is the key to the present series. The date of Gondophares is approximately known from his synchronism with the apostle Thomas. On numismatic grounds Gondophares and Jihonika have been thought contemporary, which helps to link this with the preceding series.

INSCRIPTIONS DATED IN THE ERA OF THE WESTERN SATRAPS (ŚAKA ERA), A.D. 78

| NO. | SCRIPT | ERA | B.C. | DETAILS OF INSCRIPTION | PERSONALITIES NAMED |
|-----|--------|-----|------|--|---|
| 19 | Brahmi | 42 | 119 | Nasik cave of Uṣavadata Senart, <i>EI</i> VIII (1905), 82. <i>List</i> , 1133 | Uṣavadāta only, but see below; mentions also years 41 and 45 |
| 20 | Brahmi | — | — | Nasik cave of Uṣavadata Senart, <i>EI</i> VIII (1905), 78. <i>List</i> , 1131 | Uṣavadāta, son of Dinika, and son-in-law of the rajan Kṣaharata kṣatrapa Nahapana |
| 21 | Brahmi | — | — | Nasik cave of Dakhamitra Senart, <i>EI</i> VIII (1905), 81. <i>List</i> , 1132 | Dakhamitra, daughter of the rajan Kṣaharata kṣatrapa Nahapana, and wife of Uṣavadāta, son of Dinika |
| 22 | Brahmi | — | — | Nasik cave of Dakhamitra Senart, <i>EI</i> VIII (1905), 85. <i>List</i> , 1135 | Same persons as the preceding item |
| 23 | Brahmi | 46 | 123 | Junnar cave of Ayama Bühler and Burgess, <i>Arch. Survey of Western India</i> IV, 103. <i>List</i> , 1174 | Ayama, minister to rajan mahakhatapa sāmi Nahapana |
| 24 | Brahmi | 52 | 129 | Andhau (Cutch) pillars R. D. Banerji, <i>EI</i> XVI (1921), 19 | rajan Caṣṭana, son of Zamotika, and rajan Rudradaman, son of Jayadaman (presumably ruling jointly) |
| 25 | Brahmi | 72 | 149 | Junagadh rock Kielhorn, <i>EI</i> VIII (1905), 36. <i>List</i> , 963 | rajan mahakṣatrapa Rudradaman, grandson of the rajan mahakṣatrapa Caṣṭana |

INSCRIPTIONS DATED IN THE ERA OF KANISHKA, A.D. 128

| NO. | SCRIPT | ERA | B.C. | DETAILS OF INSCRIPTION | PERSONALITIES NAMED |
|----------|--------|-----|------|---|---|
| KANISHKA | | | | | |
| 26 | Khar. | — | — | Peshawar casket of Kanishka <i>CII</i> II, 135. T. Burrow, <i>Journal of the Greater India Society</i> XI (1944), 13. B. N. Mukherjee, "Shāh-jī-kī-Dherī casket inscription", <i>BMQ</i> XXVIII (1964) 39-46 | <i>maha]raja Kani]ska</i> |
| 27 | Brahmi | 2 | 129 | Kosam Boddhisatva image K. G. Goswami, <i>EI</i> XXIV (1938), 211 | <i>mahārāja Kaṇiṣka</i> |
| 28 | Brahmi | 3 | 130 | Sārnāth Boddhisatva image of Bala J. P. Vogel, <i>EI</i> VIII (1905), 173. <i>List</i> , 925 | <i>mahārāja Kāṇiṣka; mahākṣatrapa Kharapallāna kṣatrapa Vanaspara</i> |
| 29 | Brahmi | 3 | 130 | Sārnāth <i>List</i> , 927 | <i>mahārāja Kaṇiṣka</i> |
| 30 | Khar. | 5 | 132 | 'Buddha of Brussels' G. Fussman, 'Documents epigraphiques kouchans', <i>BEFEO</i> LXI (1974), 54-8 | No ruler named |
| 31 | Brahmi | 5 | 132 | Mathurā (Kaṅkāli) Jaina image G. Bühler, <i>EI</i> , I (1898), 381. H. Lüders, <i>IndAnt</i> XXXIII, 34. <i>List</i> , 18 (Addenda and Corrigenda, p. 163) | <i>devaputra Ka[ni]ṣka</i> |
| 32 | Brahmi | 7 | 134 | Mathurā (Kaṅkāli) Jaina image G. Bühler, <i>EI</i> I (1898), 391. <i>List</i> , 21 | <i>mahārāja rājātirāja devaputra śāhi Kaṇiṣka</i> |
| 33 | Brahmi | 8 | 135 | Bhaḍār Naga image Y. R. Gupte, <i>EI</i> XVII (1923-4), 10. Agrawala II, no. 211 | <i>Kānikkha mahārāja rājātirāja śāhi</i> |

INSCRIPTIONS DATED IN THE ERA OF KANISHKA, A.D. 128 (cont.)

| NO. | SCRIPT | ERA | DETAILS OF INSCRIPTION | PERSONALITIES NAMED |
|-----|--------|--------|---|--|
| 34 | Brahmi | 9 136 | Mathurā (Kaṅkāli) Jaina image A. Cunningham, <i>ASIR</i> III (1873), 31. H. Lüders, <i>IndAnt</i> xxxiii (1904), 37. <i>List</i> , 22 (add., p. 163) | <i>mahārāja Kaṇiṣka</i> |
| 35 | Brahmi | 10 137 | Mathurā (British Museum) sculptured slab H. Lüders, <i>EI</i> ix (1906), 239. <i>List</i> , 23. Lüders, <i>Mathurā Inscriptions</i> , no. 182 | <i>mahārāja devaputra Kāṇiṣka</i> |
| 36 | Khar. | 11 138 | Sui Vihar copper-plate <i>CII</i> II, 138 | <i>mahārāja rājātirāja devaputra Kan[i]ṣka</i> |
| 37 | Khar. | 11 138 | Zeda stone block <i>CII</i> II, 142 | <i>muro(ṇ)ḍa marjhaka Kaṇiṣka rāja</i> |
| 38 | Brahmi | 16 143 | Mathurā City, Khanskhar Agrawala I, no. 2740. H. Lüders, <i>Mathurā Inscriptions</i> , no. 157 | <i>mahārāja Kāṇiṣka</i> |
| 39 | Brahmi | 17 144 | Mathurā K. D. Bajpai, <i>Jaina Antiquary</i> xvi (1950), 14 | |
| 40 | Khar. | 18 145 | Māṇikiāla stone block <i>CII</i> II, 145 | <i>mahārāja Kaṇiṣka</i> |
| 41 | Brahmi | 20 147 | Mathurā Buddhist image D. R. Sahni, <i>JRAS</i> 1924, p. 399. Agrawala I, no. 1558 | <i>mahārāja Kāṇiṣka</i> |
| 42 | Brahmi | 23 150 | Mathurā (Curzon Museum) pedestal D. R. Sahni, <i>JRAS</i> 1924, p. 400. H. Lüders, B. C. Law (ed.), <i>D. R. Bhandarkar Volume</i> , Calcutta, 1940, p. 284. Agrawala I, no. 1602. B. C. Chhabra, <i>EI</i> xxviii (1949), 42 | <i>mahārāja Kāṇiṣka</i> |

VĀSISHKA

- | | | | | | |
|----|--------|----|-----|---|---|
| 43 | Khar. | 20 | 147 | Kamra (Campbellpur) stone B. N. Mukherjee, <i>Indian Museum Bulletin</i> VIII, no. 2 (1973), 111–17 | <i>maharaja rajatiraja mahata . . . Vajeṣka</i> <i>Gushana</i> |
| 44 | Brahmi | 24 | 151 | Īsāpur pillar J. P. Vogel, <i>JRAS</i> 1910, p. 1311. <i>List</i> , 149. Agrawala IV, no. Q 13 | <i>mahārāja rājātirāja devaputra sāhi Vuāsiṣka</i> |
| 45 | Brahmi | 28 | 155 | Sānchī Buddhist statue G. Bühler, <i>EI</i> II (1899), 369. J. P. Vogel, <i>JRAS</i> 1910, p. 1314. <i>List</i> , 161 (add., p. 175) | <i>mahārāja rājātirāja devaputra ṣāh[i]</i> <i>Vāsaṣka</i> |

HUVISHKA

- | | | | | | |
|----|----------|----|-----|---|---|
| 46 | Brahmi | 28 | 155 | Mathurā (Chaurasi Jaina temple) pillar S. Konow, <i>EI</i> XXI (1931–2), 55. Agrawala IV, no. 1913. Bailey, <i>BSOAS</i> XIV (1952), 420 | <i>devaputra ṣāhi Huviṣka</i> |
| 47 | Bactrian | 31 | 158 | Surkh Kotal block of Nokonzoko Maricq, <i>JA</i> 1958, pp. 345–440. Henning, “The Bactrian inscription”, p. 48 | Nokonzoko, Borzomihro, Kozgaški- pouro, Astiloganseigi, all holders of the rank of Kanārang |
| 48 | Brahmi | 31 | 158 | Bhaḍār Buddhist image <i>List</i> , 13a (add., p. 162). Agrawala I, no. A 71 | <i>Huviṣka</i> |
| 49 | Brahmi | 33 | 160 | Mathurā (Chaubārā) Buddhist image J. P. Vogel, <i>EI</i> VIII (1905–6), 181. <i>List</i> , 38 | <i>mahārāja devaputra Huv[i]ṣka</i> |

INSCRIPTIONS DATED IN THE ERA OF KANISHKA, A.D. 128 (cont.)

| | | | | | |
|-----------------|--------|----|-----|--|--|
| 50 | Brahmi | 35 | 162 | Lākhanū Buddhist image J. P. Vogel, <i>Catalogue of the Archaeological Museum at Mathura</i> , Allahabad, 1910, p. 62. <i>List</i> , 151a. Agrawala I, no. A 63 | <i>mahārāja devaputra Huveṣka</i> |
| 51 | Brahmi | 38 | 165 | Mathurā (Kaṅkāli) elephant-capital <i>List</i> , 41 | <i>mahārāja devaputra Huviṣka</i> |
| 52 | Brahmi | 39 | 166 | Mathurā Boddhisatva image R. D. Sahni, <i>EI</i> XIX (1927), 66 | <i>mahārāja] devaputra Huviṣka</i> |
| 53 | Brahmi | 40 | 167 | Chhaṛgāon Naga image J. P. Vogel, <i>Catalogue of the Archaeological Museum at Mathura</i> , p. 88. <i>List</i> , 149b. Agrawala II, no. C 13. H. Lüders, <i>Mathurā Inscriptions</i> , no. 137 | <i>mahārāja rājātirāja Huviṣka</i> |
| KANISHKA II (?) | | | | | |
| 54 | Khar. | 41 | 168 | Ārā stone <i>CII</i> II, p. 162 | <i>mahārāja rājātirāja devaputra kaṁsara (?)</i> <i>Vajheṣkaputra Kaniṣka</i> |
| HUVISHKA | | | | | |
| 55 | Brahmi | 44 | 171 | Mathurā (Kaṅkāli) Jaina image G. Bühler, <i>EI</i> I (1898), 387 | <i>mahārāja Huviṣka</i> |
| 56 | Brahmi | 45 | 172 | Bombay University Library, Buddhist image D. R. Bhandarkar, "A Kushana stone-inscription", <i>JASBB</i> XX (1902), 269. <i>List</i> , 43 | [<i>mahārāja</i>] <i>Huviṣka devaputra</i> |

| | | | | | |
|----|--------|----|-----|--|--|
| 57 | Brahmi | 48 | 175 | Lucknow Museum Sambhavanta image R. D. Banerji, <i>EI</i> x (1910), 112. <i>List</i> , 45a | <i>mahārāja Huveṣka</i> |
| 58 | Brahmi | 48 | 175 | Mathurā (Kaṅkāli) Jaina stone Cunningham, <i>ASIR</i> III (1873), 34. <i>List</i> , 46 | <i>mahārāja Huviṣka</i> |
| 59 | Brahmi | 50 | 177 | Mathurā Buddhist (?) image Growse, <i>Mathurā</i> , 2nd edn. p. 154. <i>List</i> , 51 (add., p. 165) | <i>mahārāja devaputra Huviṣka</i> |
| 60 | Khar. | 51 | 178 | Wardak vase <i>CII</i> II, 165 | <i>maharaja rajatiraja Ho (or Hu)veṣka</i> |
| 61 | Brahmi | 51 | 178 | Mathurā (Jamālpur) Buddhist image F. S. Growse, <i>Mathurā</i> , 2nd edn., Oudh, 1880, p. 107. <i>List</i> , 52 (add., p. 166) | <i>mahārāja devaputra Huveṣka</i> |

KANISHKA II (?)

| | | | | | |
|----|--------|----|-----|---|-----------------------------------|
| 62 | Brahmi | 54 | 181 | Mathurā pedestal D. R. Sahnī, <i>EI</i> XIX (1927), 96 | <i>mahārāja devaputra Kanīṣka</i> |
|----|--------|----|-----|---|-----------------------------------|

Note: The reading for the date of this inscription is subject to some doubt. The figure adopted here is that of V. V. Mirashi, *EI* xxvi (1941–2), 293. Van Lohuizen-de Leeuw, *The “Scythian” Period*, p. 302, adopts a different date, 114, which may be preferable. Lüders, *Mathurā Inscriptions*, no. 81 reads the date as 14; the script is unusual, and the record possibly even of Kanishka III, with regnal dating.

INSCRIPTIONS DATED IN THE ERA OF KANISHKA, A.D. 128 (cont.)

HUVISHKA

| | | | | | |
|----|--------|----|-----|---|--|
| 63 | Brahmi | 58 | 185 | Mathurā (Kaṅkāli) Jaina image <i>List</i> , 42 (add., p. 165) | <i>maharaja Huviṣka</i> |
| 64 | Brahmi | 60 | 187 | Mathurā (Kaṅkāli) Jaina image G. Bühler, <i>EI</i> I (1898), 386. <i>List</i> , 56 | <i>mahārāja rājātirāja devaputra Huvaṣka</i> |

VĀSUDEVA

| | | | | | | |
|-----|----|--------|----------------|------------------|---|--|
| 230 | 65 | Brahmi | 64 or 67 | 191 or 194 | Mathurā (Palikhra) Buddhist image D. C. Sircar, <i>EI</i> xxx (1954), 181 | <i>devapu]tra Vāsudeva</i> |
| | 66 | Brahmi | 74 | 201 | Mathurā (Jamālpur) slab H. Lüders, <i>EI</i> ix (1907), 241. <i>List</i> , 60 | <i>mahārāja r[ājātirāja] devaputra Vāsu[devu</i> |
| | 67 | Brahmi | 80 | 207 | Mathurā (Kaṅkāli) Jaina image G. Bühler, <i>EI</i> I (1898), 392. <i>List</i> , 66 (add., p. 167) | <i>mahārāja Vāsudeva</i> |
| | 68 | Brahmi | 83 | 210 | Mathurā (Kaṅkāli) Jaina image Cunningham, <i>ASIR</i> III (1873), 34. <i>List</i> , 68 (add., p. 167). Agrawala III, no. B 2 | <i>mahārāja Vāsudeva</i> |
| | 69 | Brahmi | 84 | 211 | Mathurā, Balabhadra Kuṇḍ Jaina image <i>List</i> , 69a (p. 168). Agrawala III, no. B 4 | <i>mahārāja rājātirāja devaputra [ṣā]hi Vāsudeva</i> |
| | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|-----|----|--------|----|-----|---|--|
| 231 | 70 | Brahmi | 87 | 214 | Mathurā (Kaṅkāli) Jaina image Cunningham, <i>ASIR</i> III (1873), 35. <i>List</i> , 72 | <i>maharaja rajatiraja śāhir Vvāsudeva</i> |
| | 71 | Brahmi | 93 | — | Mathurā, New Bridge Buddha image V. N. Srivasta, <i>EI</i> xxxvii, pt. iv, 1967, 151-3 | <i>mahārāja dēvaṇputra vasudēva</i> |
| | 72 | Brahmi | 98 | 225 | Mathurā (Kaṅkāli) Jaina image Cunningham, <i>ASIR</i> III (1873), 35. <i>List</i> , 76 | <i>rājña Vāsudeva</i> |
| | 73 | Brahmi | 99 | 226 | Mathurā (Kaṅkāli) Jaina panel V. A. Smith, <i>ASI</i> (New Imperial series) xx (1901), 24. Reading as emended by H. Lüders, <i>JRAS</i> 1912, p. 154. <i>List</i> , 75 (add., p. 168) | No emperor mentioned |

Note: Not included in this list is the Sānchī inscription of the *rājā Vaskuṣāṇa* or *Vaskuṣāṇa* of the year 22 or 122; cf. van Lohuizen-de Leeuw, *The "Scythian" Period*, p. 313, of which the interpretation is uncertain.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The abbreviations used in the bibliographies and footnotes are listed below.

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| <i>AA</i> | <i>Archäologischer Anzeiger</i> (Beiblatt zum Jahrbuch des deutschen archäologischen Instituts) (Berlin) |
| <i>AAWG</i> | <i>Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen</i> (Phil. Hist. Klasse) (Göttingen) |
| <i>AAntASH</i> | <i>Acta antiqua academiae scientiarum Hungaricae</i> (Budapest) |
| <i>AArchASH</i> | <i>Acta archaeologica academiae scientiarum Hungaricae</i> (Budapest) |
| <i>AB</i> | <i>Analecta Bollandiana</i> (Brussels) |
| <i>Acta Iranica</i> | <i>Acta Iranica</i> (encyclopédie permanente des études iraniennes) (Tehran-Liège-Leiden) |
| <i>Aevum</i> | <i>Aevum</i> (Rassegna di Scienze Storiche Linguistiche e Filologiche) (Milan) |
| <i>AGWG</i> | <i>Abhandlungen der (königlichen) Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen</i> (Berlin) |
| <i>AI</i> | <i>Ars Islamica</i> = <i>Ars Orientalis</i> (Ann Arbor, Mich.) |
| <i>AION</i> | <i>Annali: Istituto Orientale di Napoli</i> (s.l. sezione linguistica; n.s. new series) (Naples) |
| <i>AJSLL</i> | <i>American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature</i> (Chicago) |
| <i>AKM</i> | <i>Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes</i> (Leipzig) |
| <i>AMI</i> | <i>Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran</i> (old series 9 vols 1929-38; new series 1968-) (Berlin) |
| <i>Anatolia</i> | <i>Anatolia</i> (revue annuelle d'archéologie) (Ankara) |
| <i>ANS</i> | American Numismatic Society |
| <i>ANSMN</i> | <i>American Numismatic Society Museum Notes</i> (New York) |
| <i>ANSNM</i> | American Numismatic Society Numismatic Notes and Monographs (New York) |
| <i>ANSNS</i> | American Numismatic Society Numismatic Studies (New York) |
| <i>Antiquity</i> | <i>Antiquity</i> (a periodical review of archaeology edited by Glyn Daniel) (Cambridge) |
| <i>AO</i> | <i>Acta Orientalia</i> (ediderunt Societates Orientales Batava Danica Norvegica Svedica) (Copenhagen) |
| <i>AOAW</i> | <i>Anzeiger der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften</i> (Phil. Hist. Klasse) (Vienna) |
| <i>AOH</i> | <i>Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae</i> (Budapest) |
| <i>APAW</i> | <i>Abhandlungen der Preussischen (Deutschen) Akademie der Wissenschaften</i> (Phil. Hist. Klasse) (Berlin) |
| <i>Apollo</i> | <i>Apollo</i> (The magazine of the arts) (London) |
| <i>ArOr</i> | <i>Archiv Orientalní</i> (Quarterly Journal of African, Asian and Latin American Studies) (Prague) |
| <i>Artibus Asiae</i> | <i>Artibus Asiae</i> (Institute of Fine Arts, New York University) (Dresden, Ascona) |

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Asia Major* *Asia Major* (a journal devoted to the study of the languages, arts and civilizations of the Far East and Central Asia) old series, 11 vols (Leipzig, 1923-35); (a British journal of Far Eastern studies) new series, 19 vols (London, 1949-75)
- ASIR* *Archaeological Survey of India*. Reports made during the years 1862- by Alexander Cunningham, 23 vols. Simla-Calcutta, 1871-87.
- BASOR* *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* (Baltimore, Maryland)
- BCH* *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* (Athens-Paris)
- BCMA* *The Bulletin of the Cleveland Museum of Art* (Cleveland, Ohio)
- BEFEO* *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême Orient* (Hanoi-Paris)
- Berytus* *Berytus* (archaeological studies published by the Museum of Archaeology and the American University of Beirut) (Copenhagen)
- BMQ* *British Museum Quarterly* (London)
- BSO(A)S* *Bulletin of the School of Oriental (and African) Studies* (University of London)
- Byzantion* *Byzantion* (Revue Internationale des Études Byzantines) (Brussels)
- CAH* *The Cambridge Ancient History*, 12 vols; 1st edition 1924-39 (Cambridge) (Revised edition 1970-)
- Caucasica* *Caucasica* (Zeitschrift für die Erforschung der Sprachen und Kulturen des Kaukasus und Armeniens) 10 fascs (Leipzig, 1924-34)
- CII* *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum* (Oxford)
- CIIr* *Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum* (London)
- CRAI* *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles lettres* (Paris)
- CSCO* *Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium* (Paris, Louvain)
- CSEL* *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* (Vienna)
- DOAW* *Denkschriften der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Phil. Hist. Klasse) (Vienna)
- East and West* *East and West* (Quarterly published by the Instituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Orient) (Rome)
- EI* *Epigraphia Indica* (Calcutta)
- Eos* *Eos* (Commentarii Societatis Philologiae Polonorum) (Bratislava-Warsaw)
- EPRO* *Études préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'Empire romain* (Leiden)
- Eranos* *Eranos* (Acta Philologica Suecana) (Uppsala)
- ERE* *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, ed. James Hastings, 13 vols (Edinburgh, 1908-21)
- GCS* *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte* (Leipzig, Berlin)
- Georgica* *Georgica* (a journal of Georgian and Caucasian studies) nos. 1-5 (London, 1935-7)
- GJ* *The Geographical Journal* (London)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Gnomon* *Gnomon* (Kritische Zeitschrift für die gesamte klassische Altertumswissenschaft) (Munich)
- Hellenica* *Hellenica* (recueil d'épigraphie de numismatique et d'antiquités grecques) (Paris)
- Historia* *Historia* (Journal of Ancient History) (Wiesbaden)
- HJAS* *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* (Cambridge, Mass.)
- HO* *Handbuch der Orientalistik*, ed. B. Spuler (Leiden-Cologne)
- HOS* *Harvard Oriental Series* (Cambridge, Mass.)
- IA* *Iranica Antiqua* (Leiden)
- IJJ* *Indo-Iranian Journal* (The Hague)
- IndAnt* *The Indian Antiquary*, 62 vols (Bombay, 1872-1933)
- Iran* *Iran* (journal of the British Institute of Persian Studies) (London-Tehran)
- Iraq* *Iraq* (journal of the British School of Archaeology in Iraq) (London)
- JA* *Journal Asiatique* (Paris)
- JAOS* *Journal of the American Oriental Society* (New York)
- JASB* *Journal (and proceedings) of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* (Calcutta)
- JASBB* *Journal of the Asiatic Society Bombay Branch* (Bombay)
- JCOI* *Journal of the K. R. Cama Oriental Institute*, 29 vols (Bombay, 1922-35)
- JCS* *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* (New Haven, Conn.)
- JESHO* *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* (Leiden)
- JHS* *Journal of Hellenic Studies* (London)
- JMBRAS* *Journal of the Malayan Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* (Singapore)
- JNES* *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* (Chicago)
- JNSI* *Journal of the Numismatic Society of India* (Bombay)
- JRAS* *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (London)
- JRS* *The Journal of Roman Studies* (London)
- Kairos* *Kairos* (Zeitschrift für Religionswissenschaft und Theologie) (Salzburg)
- Klio* *Klio* (Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte) (Berlin)
- Kuml* *Kuml* (Aarbog for Jysk Arkaeologisk Selskab) (Aarhus)
- KSIIIMK* *Kratkie soobshcheniya o dokladakh i polevykh issledovaniyakh Instituta istorii materialnoi kultury AN SSR* (Moscow)
- KZ* *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung*, begründet von Adalbert Kuhn (Göttingen)
- LCL* Loeb Classical Library
- MDAFA* *Mémoires de la délégation archéologique française en Afghanistan* (Paris)
- Mesopotamia* *Mesopotamia* (Rivista di Archeologia, Faculta di Lettere e filosofia) (University of Turin)
- MMAB* *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin* (old series 1905-42; new series 1942-) (New York)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- MMP *Monuments et Mémoires* (publiés par l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-lettres) (Fondation Eugène Piot, Paris)
- Le Muséon* *Le Muséon* (Revue d'Études Orientales) (Louvain-Paris)
- Museum* *Museum* (art magazine edited by the Tokyo National Museum) (Tokyo)
- NC *Numismatic Chronicle* (London)
- NGWG *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen* (Göttingen)
- Numismatica* *Numismatica* (Rome)
- OLZ *Orientalische Literaturzeitung* (Berlin-Leipzig)
- Oriens* *Oriens* (journal of the International Society for Oriental Research) (Leiden)
- Orientalia* *Orientalia* (a quarterly published by the Faculty of Ancient Oriental Studies, Pontifical Biblical Institute) new series (Rome)
- Pauly *Pauly, A. Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* (ed. G. Wissowa) (Stuttgart, 1894-)
- PBA *Proceedings of the British Academy* (London)
- Philologus* *Philologus* (Zeitschrift für das klassische Altertum) (Stolberg, etc., now Berlin)
- PO *Patrologia Orientalis* (ed. R. Gaffin and F. Nau) (Paris)
- RAA *Revue des arts asiatiques* (Paris)
- RAC *Reallexicon für Antike und Christentum* (ed. T. Klauser) (Stuttgart, 1950-)
- REA *Revue des études arméniennes, nouvelle série* (Paris)
- Religion* *Religion* (A Journal of Religion and Religions) (Newcastle upon Tyne)
- RGG *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, 2nd ed., 6 vols (Tübingen, 1927-32); 3rd ed., 7 vols (Tübingen, 1957-65)
- RHR *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* (Paris)
- RIN *Rivista Italiana di Numismatica e Scienze Affini* (Milan)
- RN *Revue Numismatique* (Paris)
- RSO *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* (Rome)
- Saeculum* *Saeculum* (Jahrbuch für Universalgeschichte) (Freiburg-Munich)
- SBE *Sacred Books of the East* (Oxford)
- SCBO *Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis* (Oxford)
- Semitica* *Semitica* (Cahiers publiés par l'Institut d'Études Sémitiques de l'Université de Paris) (Paris)
- SHAW *Sitzungsberichte der heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Phil. Hist. Klasse) (Heidelberg)
- SPA *A Survey of Persian Art*, ed. A. U. Pope and P. Ackerman, 6 vols (Text pp. 1-2817) (Oxford-London-New York, 1938-39); repr. 12 vols (Tokyo, 1964-65); no vol. XIII; vol. XIV *New Studies 1938-1960* (Text pp. 2879-3205) (Oxford-London, 1967); vol. XV *Bibliography of Pre-Islamic Persian Art to 1938* (cols 1-340), Reprint of *Index to Text Volumes I-III (i-vi)*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- SPA (cont.)* (pp. 1-63) (Ashiya, Japan, 1977); vol. xvi *Bibliography of Islamic Persian Art to 1938* (cols 341-854) (Ashiya, 1977); vol. xvii *New Studies 1960-1973. In Memoriam Arthur Upham Pope, Part I Pre-Islamic Studies* (pp. 3207-3717) (not yet published); vol. xviii *New Studies 1960-1973... Part II Islamic Architecture* (not yet published); vol. xix *New Studies 1960-1973... Part III Islamic Art* (not yet published). References are given to page numbers only.
- SPAW* *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen (Deutschen) Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Phil. Hist. Klasse) (Berlin)
- StIr* *Studia Iranica* (Leiden)
- Sumer* *Sumer* (journal of archaeology and history in Iraq) (Baghdad)
- SWAW* *Sitzungsberichte der Wiener (Österreichischen) Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Phil. Hist. Klasse) (Vienna)
- Syria* *Syria* (Revue d'art oriental et d'archéologie) (Paris)
- TITAKE* *Trudi Iuzhno-Turkmenistanskoi Archeologicheskoi Kimpleknoi Ekspeditsii*, 6 vols (Moscow, 1949-58)
- TM* *Travaux et mémoires* (Centre de Recherche d'Histoire et Civilisation de Byzance) (Paris)
- T'oung Pao* *T'oung Pao* (Archives concernant l'histoire, les langues, la géographie, l'ethnographie et les arts de l'Asie orientale) (Leiden)
- TPS* *Transactions of the Philological Society* (London)
- VDI* *Vestnik drevnei istorii* (Moscow)
- WVDOG* *Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft* (Leipzig)
- WZKM* *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* (Vienna)
- YCS* *Yale Classical Studies* (New Haven, Conn.)
- ZA* *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* (Berlin)
- ZDMG* *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft* (Wiesbaden)
- ZN* *Zeitschrift für Numismatik* (Berlin)

The following frequently quoted works are given in an abbreviated form marked with an asterisk

- Christensen, A. *L'Iran sous les Sassanides*, 2nd ed. Copenhagen-Paris, 1944 (Annales du Musée Guimet, Bibliothèque d'Études 48).
- Diakonoff, I. M. and Livshits, V. A. *Dokumenty iz Nisy I v. do n.e. Predvaritelnye itogi raboti* (Documents from Nisā of the 1st century B.C. Preliminary summary of the work). Moscow, 1960.
- "Parfianskoje tsarskoje chozajstvo v Nise", *VDI* 1960.2, pp. 14-38.
- "Novye nakhodki dokumentov v staroi Nise" (New kinds of documents at old Nisa), in *Peredneaziatskii Sbornik II* (Near Eastern Symposium no. II) (Moscow, 1966), pp. 135-57 (English summary, pp. 169-73).
- Parthian economic documents from Nisā*, ed. by D. N. MacKenzie, Plates I (London, 1976), Plates II (London, 1977), Texts I, pp. 1-80 (*CIIr*, Part II, Vol. II).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Firdausī. *Shāh-nāma*, Beroukhim edition, 10 vols. Tehran, 1313/1934-1315/1936. Gives corresponding page numbers in the editions of Turner Macan (4 vols, Calcutta, 1829) and J. Mohl (text and French translation, 7 vols, Paris, 1838-78).
 Moscow edition, 9 vols. 1963-71.
 Mohl's French translation printed separately, 7 vols. Paris, 1876-8.
 English translation A. G. and E. Warner, 9 vols. London, 1905-25 (Trubner's Oriental Series).
 Abridged English translation R. Levy, *The Epic of the Kings*. London, 1967 (Persian Heritage Series).
 Ghirshman, R. *Iran. Parthians and Sassanians*. London, 1962 (American edition is entitled *Persian Art 249 B.C.-A.D. 651*).
 Henning, W. B. "Mitteliranisch", in *Iranistik* 1, *Linguistik* (Leiden, 1958), pp. 20-130 (*HO* I. IV. 1).
 Hill, G. F. *Catalogue of the Greek coins of Arabia, Mesopotamia and Persia*. London, 1922 (Catalogue of the Greek coins in the British Museum).
 Le Rider, G. *Suse sous les Séleucides et les Parthes*. Paris, 1965 (*Mémoires de la Mission archéologique en Iran* 38).
 Maricq, A. "Classica et Orientalia 5, Res Gestae Divi Saporis", *Syria* xxxv (1958), pp. 295-360; reprinted with revisions in *Classica et Orientalia, extrait de Syria 1955-62* (Paris, 1965), pp. 37-101 (Publication hors série 11).
 Nöldeke, T. (tr.) *Tabari = Geschichte der Perser und Araber zur Zeit der Sasaniden, aus der arabischen Chronik des Tabari*. Leiden, 1879.
 West, E. W. *Pahlavi texts*, 5 vols. Oxford, 1880-97. Repr. Patna, 1965 (*SBE* 5, 18, 24, 37, 47).
 Wroth, W. W. *The Catalogue of the coins of Parthia*. London, 1903 (Catalogue of the Greek coins in the British Museum).

CHAPTER I

I. Sources

Classical authors: the relevant passages are mostly referred to in Bevan, *The house of Selencus* (below). Greek inscriptions: a list can be found in L. Robert, "Encore une inscription grecque de l'Iran", *CRAI* 1967, p. 281. For later discoveries see the yearly reports of J. and L. Robert in "Bulletin épigraphique", *Revue des études grecques* (Paris).

Archaeological evidence: the latest, though already outdated survey is to be found in L. Vanden Berghe, *Archéologie de l'Iran ancien* (Leiden, 1959), pp. 223ff.

Bernard, P. (ed.). *Fouilles de Ai Khanoum* I. Paris, 1973 (MDAFA 21).

"Fouilles de Ai Khanoum", *CRAI* 1974, pp. 270-312.

Frumkin, G. *Archaeology in Soviet Central Asia*. Leiden, 1970 (*HO* VII. III. 1).

Leriche, R. "Ai Khanoum", *Revue Archéologique* (Paris, 1974), pp. 231-

CHAPTER 4

The Origins of the Islamic State, part 1 (New York, 1916), part 2 by F. Murgotten (New York, 1924) is perhaps the most valuable source on the Arab conquests. For the Islamic sources see Spüler, *op. cit.*

CHAPTER 5

- Agrawala, V. S. *Matura Museum Catalogue*, vols 1- . Lucknow, 1948- (U.P. Historical Society).
- Bailey, H. W. "Kaṇaṣka", *JRAS* 1942, pp. 14-28.
- "Hārahūna" in *Asiatica: Festschrift Friedrich Weller* (Leipzig, 1954), pp. 12-21.
- "Languages of the Saka", in *Iranistik I, Linguistik* (Leiden, 1958), pp. 131-54 (*HO* 1. IV. 1).
- Basham, A. L. (ed.), *Papers on the date of Kanishka*. Leiden, 1968.
- Bernard, P. et al. *Fouilles d'Ai Khanoum* 1, pts 1 and 2. Paris, 1973 (MDAFA xxi).
- Benveniste, E. "La ville de Cyreschata", *JA* 1943-5, pp. 163-6.
- Bivar, A. D. H. "The Kanishka dating from Surkh Kotal", *BOSAS* xxvi (1963), pp. 498-502.
- "Indo-Bactrian problems", *NC* 1965, pp. 71-108.
- "The sequence of Menander's drachmae", *JRAS* 1970, pp. 123-36.
- "Hāriti and the chronology of the Kuṣāṇas", *BSOAS* xxxiii (1970), pp. 10-21.
- Bosworth, C. E. "The armies of the Ṣaffārids", *BSOAS* xxxi (1968), pp. 534-54.
- "The Turks in the Islamic lands up to the mid-11th Century", *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta* III, pt. 1 (Wiesbaden, 1970), pp. 1-20.
- Brough, J. *The Gandhari Dharmapada*. London, 1962.
- Curiel, R. and Fussman, G. *Le trésor monétaire de Qunduz*. Paris, 1965 (MDAFA xx).
- Dalton, O. M. *The treasure of the Oxus, with other examples of early Oriental metalwork*, 3rd ed. London, 1964.
- Dobbins, K. W. *The Stūpa and Vihāra of Kanishka I*. Calcutta, 1971. (The Asiatic Society Monograph Series 18).
- Enoki, K. "On the nationality of the Ephthalites", *Memoirs of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko* xviii (1959), pp. 1-58.
- Frye, R. N. *The Heritage of Persia*. London, 1962.
- Frye, R. N. and Sayili, A. M. "Turks in the Middle East before the Saljuqs", *JAOs* lxiii (1943), pp. 194-207.
- Fussman, G. "Documents épigraphiques kouchans", *BEFEO* lxi (1974), pp. 1-66.
- Ghirshman, R. *Les Chionites-Hephthalites*. Cairo, 1948. (MDAFA xiii).
- Göbl, R. *Dokumente zur Geschichte der Iranischen Hunnen in Baktrien und Indien*, 4 vols. Wiesbaden, 1967. The plates are comprehensive illustrations of the coins, but the text and interpretations should be used with caution.
- Hackin, J. R. *Nouvelles recherches archéologiques à Begram (1939-40)*. Paris, 1954 (MDAFA xi).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Hambly, G. (ed.) *Central Asia*. London, 1969. Chapter 2, The nomad empires and the expansion of Buddhism. Chapter 3, Sasanians and Turks in Central Asia.
- Henning, W. B. "The date of the Sogdian Ancient Letters", *BSOAS* xii (1948), p. 603.
- "The Aramaic inscription of Asoka found in Lampāka", *BSOAS* xiii (1949), pp. 80-8.
- "The Bactrian inscription", *BSOAS* xxiii (1960), pp. 47-55.
- Herzfeld, E. *Kushano-Sasanian Coins*. Calcutta, 1930 (Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India 38).
- Humbach, H. *Baktrische Sprachdenkmäler*, 2 vols. Wiesbaden, 1966-7. A valuable collection of the Bactrian inscriptions, though inevitably some of the interpretations are a trifle speculative.
- Jenkins, G. K. "Indo-Scythic mints", *JNSI* xvii (1955), pt. 1, pp. 1-26.
- Jettmar, K. (tr. A. E. Keep) *Art of the Steppes; the Eurasian animal style*. London, 1967 (Art of the World 21).
- Konow, S. *Kharoshthī Inscriptions*. Calcutta, 1929 (*CII* II, pt. i).
- Lamotte, E. *Histoire du Bouddhisme Indien. Des origines à l'Ere Saka*. Louvain, 1958; repr. 1967.
- Le Berre, M. and Schlumberger, D. "Observations sur les remparts de Bactres" in Dagens, B., Le Berre, M. and Schlumberger, D., *Monuments préislamiques d'Afghanistan* (Paris, 1964), pp. 67-104. (MDAFA xix).
- Le Rider, G. "Monnaies de Taxila et d'Arachosie: une nouvelle Reine de Taxila", *Revue des Études Grecques* LXXX (Paris, 1967), pp. 137-48.
- Lohuizen de Leeuw, J. E. van. *The "Scythian" period*. Leiden, 1949. (*Orientalia Rheno-traiectina* 2). This work contains much interesting material, but the general view of Indian chronology which it presents is far from clear, and it needs to be used discriminatingly and with caution.
- Lüders, H. *Mathurā inscriptions*. Göttingen, 1961.
- List of Brahmi inscriptions from the earliest times to A.D. 400, with the exception of those of Asoka*. Appendix to *EI* x (1912).
- MacDowall, D. W. "The dynasty of the later Indo-Parthians", *NC* 1965, pp. 137-148.
- "Implications for Kushan chronology of the numismatic context of the Nameless King", in *Tsentral'nava Aziya v Kushanskuyu épokhu* I (Moscow, 1974), pp. 246-64.
- McGovern, W. M. *The early empires of Central Asia*. Chapel Hill, 1939.
- Maricq, A. "La grand inscription de Kanīṣka et l'éteo-Tokharien, l'ancienne langue de la Bactriane", *JA* 1958, pp. 345-440.
- Minorsky, V. "The Turkish dialect of the Khalaj", *BSOAS* x (1940-2), pp. 417-37.
- Modi, J. J. "The early history of the Huns", *JASBB* 1915-17, pp. 567-95.
- Narain, A. K. *The Indo-Greeks*. Oxford, 1957.
- Newell, E. T. *Coinage of the Eastern Seleucid mints*. New York, 1938 (ANSNS 1).

CHAPTER 5

- Reichelt, H. *Die soghdischen Handschriftenreste des Britischen Museums*, 2 vols. Heidelberg, 1928-31.
- Robert, L. "Inscription hellénistique d'Iran", *Hellenica* xi-xii (1960), pp. 88-91.
- Schlumberger, D. "The excavations at Surkh Kotal and the problem of Hellenism in Bactria and India", *PBA* XLVII (1961), pp. 77-94.
- Schlumberger, D. and Bernard, P. "Aï Khanoum", *BCH* LXXIX (1965), pp. 590-657.
- Sircar, D. C. "Three early medieval inscriptions", *EI* xxxv (1963), pp. 45-7.
- Stein, M. A. *Serindia*, 5 vols. Oxford, 1921.
- Tarn, W. W. *The Greeks in Bactria and India*, 2nd ed. Cambridge, 1951.
- Warder, A. K. *Indian Buddhism*. Delhi, 1970.
- Wheeler, M. *Rome beyond the Imperial Frontiers* (London, 1954), pp. 115-70.
- Wolski, J. "The decay of the Iranian Empire of the Seleucids and the chronology of Parthian beginnings", *Berytus* xii (1956-7), pp. 35-52.
- Wright, W. *The Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles* II. London, 1871.
- Zürcher, E. *The Buddhist conquest of China: the spread and adaptation of Buddhism in early mediaeval China*, 2 vols. Leiden, 1959.

CHAPTER 6

See the bibliographies to Chapters 30, 33 and 35.

CHAPTER 7

- Bailey, H. W. *Khotanese texts*, vols 1-5. Cambridge, 1945-63.
- Khotanese Buddhist texts*. London, 1951.
- "Languages of the Saka", in *Iranistik I, Linguistik* (Leiden, 1958), pp. 131-54 (*HO* I. IV. 1).
- Barthold, W. *Turkestan down to the Mongol invasion*, 3rd ed. London, 1968 (E. J. W. Gibb Memorial, n.s. v).
- Beal, S. *Si-yu-ki. Buddhist records of the western world*, vols 1-2. London, 1884.
- The Life of Hiuen-tsiang*. London, 1888.
- Boyce, M. *A catalogue of the Iranian manuscripts in Manichean script in the German Turfan collection*. Berlin, 1960.
- Chavannes, É. *Documents sur les Tou-kiue (Turcs) occidentaux*. St Petersburg, 1903; repr. Paris, undated.
- Chavannes, É and Pelliot, P. "Un traité manichéen retrouvé en Chine", *JA* 1913, pp. 177-99.
- Eberhard, W. "The leading families of ancient Tun-huang", *Sinologica* IV (Basle, 1956), pp. 69-90, 209-32.
- Emmerick, R. E. *Tibetan texts concerning Khotan*. Oxford, 1967.
- Giles, L. *Six centuries at Tunhuang*, London, 1944.
- The travels of Fa-hsien*, Cambridge 1923; repr. London, 1956.
- "A Topographical Fragment from Tunhuang", *BSOS* VII (1933-5), pp. 545-72.
- "A census of Tun-huang", *T'oung Pao* XVI (1915), pp. 468-88.